

disposed of by the Government in any manner whatsoever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5215. A bill to amend the Classification Act of March 4, 1923, as amended, to create a mechanical service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5216. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5217. A bill granting travel pay and allowance for subsistence to certain soldiers of the Regular Army who served in the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5218. A bill for the relief of Herman Paul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5219. A bill to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines through and across lands of the United States within the area of Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir, located in York County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5220. A bill for the relief of R. W. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6022. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Joe Stuckey and 38 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6023. Also, petition of Anton Hoecker and 35 others protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6024. Also, petition of Leo H. Boehmer and 30 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6025. Also, petition of Martha Krueger and 58 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6026. Also, petition of Victor Becker and 73 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 15, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. Thou hast set Thy glory above the heavens. We come to Thee. We find ourselves between an informing and warning past and an un-

certain but all-important future. We pray for all interests which enter into the making of a surer, stronger, safer world. We pray that our Government may be increasingly efficient and far reaching for good. May business, professional life, and industry ever be animated on behalf of human welfare. May our educational and religious agencies have unflinching success in advancing Thy plans for the whole wide world.

Be unto Thy servants of this and other departments of government wisdom for this day. May those who are kept by illness from places of duty have the blessings of the Great Physician. Bless their homes and families and the family life of all our people. Blot out our transgressions and create a new heart, we pray, in the whole earth. In the name of Him who gave His life for the establishment of righteousness and good will we make our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, August 18, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT BILL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Committee on Military Affairs, I think, will be able to report the surplus property disposal bill some time today. I therefore ask unanimous consent that authority be granted the committee to report the bill even though the Senate may not be in session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BENNETT CHAMP CLARK OF MISSOURI

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article on BENNETT CLARK, by Will P. Kennedy, published in yesterday's Washington Post.

Mr. President, as we all know, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has recently been defeated by a small majority for renomination, and I am sure every Member of the Senate who knows him greatly regrets that he will not serve longer with us. I think he has made one of the finest Senators that Missouri has ever had.

Mr. President, I do not know whether this is the proper time to say it, but I want to say a few words about BENNETT CLARK and his people. I have known BENNETT CLARK ever since he was a student in college. I knew him when he served as a Parliamentarian in the House of Representatives. I was a Member of the House at that time. His father, Champ Clark, was Speaker of the House about the time when I entered that body, and was Speaker when I left. He became my friend after I arrived and was always most friendly to me until the day of his death. Speaker Clark was one of the truly great men produced by this Republic. He was a great scholar, a

great thinker, a great doer, a great and eloquent talker, and a truly great statesman, with the biggest, kindest, most generous heart that any man ever had.

BENNETT CLARK has great ability, a fine brain, breeding, courtesy, genuineness, kindness, quickness of mind, simplicity of character, vigor of intellect, and is in every way a great and scholarly statesman. There is no better equipped Senator in this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

The defeat for renomination of Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, removes temporarily from the Capitol political stage one of the great family names of American politics. Boy and man, BENNETT CLARK has been popular at the Capitol for more than 40 years. He graduated from Eastern High School in 1908, was Parliamentarian of the House from 1913 to 1917, when he attended the First Officers' Training Camp at Fort Myer; then was assistant chief of staff in the Eighty-eighth and Thirty-fifth Divisions, American Expeditionary Force and subsequently chairman of the Paris caucus of the 17 charter members who incorporated the American Legion. He was the youngest colonel in the American Army in France.

His father, former Speaker Champ Clark, whose real name was James Beauchamp Clark, first came into national politics in 1880, when he was a Presidential elector on the ticket of Hancock and English, when Garfield was elected. It is not generally known that Champ Clark was president of Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va., 1873 and 1874. He first came to Congress on March 4, 1893 (when his son BENNETT was 3 years old). Defeated in the Harding landslide of 1920, he died 2 days after his term was to end. He was Democratic leader in the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses and Speaker in the next two Congresses. His later years were embittered by the fact that he believed that the Presidential nomination had been stolen from him in the Baltimore convention of 1912, when he led on 29 ballots and had a clear majority on 8. What really broke his spirit, however, was the death of his grandson and namesake. In his reminiscences of a Quarter Century of American Politics, Champ Clark in a chapter on Heredity in Politics wrote: "There are many instances in our annals where the tendency toward political life and the ability to succeed therein have descended from father to son. In all fairness, it should be stated that in many cases the sons are of greater ability than their fathers." Champ Clark had gone to his reward 12 years before his son came to the Senate, February 3, 1933.

Speaker Champ Clark had two office boys who grew up together under his watchful eye and for whom he confidently predicted success in the public service. That estimation has been realized. He made each in turn his parliamentarian—first his son BENNETT, who later became United States Senator, and then CLARENCE CANNON, who later succeeded to his seat in the House and is now chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Senator CLARK, it will be remembered, led the fight in the 1936 Democratic National Convention for abolition of the party's two-thirds rule, which had blocked his father's nomination for President a quarter of a century previous.

The guiding hand of divine providence staged a scene in the Capitol a few years ago which must have pleased the soul of Champ Clark, looking down. One day Representative CANNON was called to the chair formerly occupied by Champ Clark by Speaker Bankhead to preside in the Committee of the

Whole House. And on the same day, at the same hour, Senator CLARK was called upon by Vice President Garner to preside in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey) on August 19, 1944, signed the enrolled bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes," which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on August 19, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law Numbered 346, current session, entitled "Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 21, 1944, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE (H. DOC. NO. 671)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying recommendations, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 29, 1944, I had occasion to transmit to the Congress a declaration and two resolutions adopted by the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference, which was held in Philadelphia April 20-May 12, 1944. I then stated that upon receipt of the authentic text of the recommendations adopted by the conference I would transmit these to the Congress, as required by the constitution of the International Labor Organization. These texts having now been received, I transmit them herewith. The recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation (No. 67) concerning income security.

Recommendation (No. 68) concerning income security and medical care for persons discharged from the armed forces and assimilated services and from war employment.

Recommendation (No. 69) concerning medical care.

Recommendation (No. 70) concerning minimum standards of social policy in dependent Territories.

Recommendation (No. 71) concerning employment organization in the transition from war to peace.

Recommendation (No. 72) concerning the Employment Service.

Recommendation (No. 73) concerning the national planning of public works.

Employers and workers, as well as governments, were represented at the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference which adopted these recommendations by large majorities. As these recommendations were developed with a view to promoting the social security and economic advancement of the peoples of the world, our own included, I believe the Congress will find them valuable in its current consideration of problems of demobilization, reconversion of industry, employment, and social security.

At a later time I may have occasion to direct further attention to specific provisions of these recommendations and to suggest what action by the Congress on these recommendations may be advisable.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, August 22, 1944.

[Enclosure: Authentic copy of the recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-sixth session.]

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I request that the message from the President, with the accompanying papers, be printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL PEACE ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION OF INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Inter-American Bar Association at its third conference, held in the city of Mexico on August 7, 1944, a resolution concerning the establishment of a permanent international or-

ganization was adopted. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this association at its second conference held at Rio de Janeiro in August 1943 adopted resolution No. 4, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Inter-American Bar Association endorses as a primary peace objective the establishment and maintenance, at the earliest possible moment, of a universal international system, with judicial, legislative, and executive functions based on moral and juridical principles and on the internal experience of all nations and adapted to the requirements and limitations of international cooperation."

Now, therefore, consistent with and in further development of the principles and purposes so declared and supported in the foregoing resolution; be it

Resolved, That the Inter-American Bar Association, at its third conference held in the city of Mexico, D. C., on August 7, 1944, declares itself to favor the following principles and program in general terms, namely:

1. That a permanent international organization be established by the nations to maintain peace by the prevention and suppression of aggressive war.

2. That this permanent international organization should include a general assembly in which all of the nations shall be equally represented.

3. That the permanent international organization should include a permanent executive agency to administer the business of the organization between sessions of the assembly. The members of the executive agency shall be designated by the assembly.

4. That the general international organization include the existing Permanent Court of International Justice, with the necessary adaptation of its statute to the new organization, and the court should be empowered to create chambers, special or regional, as need arises, and

5. That the assembly have power to create from time to time such inferior courts as may be necessary.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—REPORT OF POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported an original bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, submitted a report (No. 1056) thereon, and the bill was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES REPORT ON GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 227)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate

Resolution 318, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 318) submitted by Mr. BYRD on August 9, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 227, current session, an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to Government corporations, be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY— REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2065) to establish a Surplus War Property Administration; to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property; and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1057) thereon.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER (for Mr. BARKLEY), from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2091. A bill for the relief of the Aetna Insurance Co.;

S. 2092. A bill for the relief of Ida Erickson;

S. 2093. A bill for the relief of Zella Rickard; and

S. 2094. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain military personnel for loss of personal property as a result of a fire which destroyed the laundry at Winter General Hospital, at Topeka, Kans., on March 31, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2095. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2096. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought by carriers by motor vehicle for the recovery of their charges; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2097. A bill for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates; and

S. 2098. A bill for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2099 (by request). A bill to place on the retired list certain former commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2100. A bill to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irri-

gation, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2102 (by request). A bill relating to transfer, inheritance and estate taxes on the transfer of certain properties of tribal and individual Osage Indians of Oklahoma; and

S. 2103 (by request). A bill to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma and conveyances in the State of Oklahoma where Indian lands of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians are involved; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2104. A bill to provide for increasing the loan rate in the case of loans upon cotton made by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported original Senate bill 2105, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

AIR POLICY COMMISSION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on August 18 the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 146 proposing the establishment of an air policy commission for the purpose of developing "sound national policies on the problem created by and associated with present and future developments in military and civil aviation."

The joint resolution was referred to the Military Affairs Committee. At the request of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is unable to be present today, I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that in our view the reference to the Military Affairs Committee was inappropriate.

The Commerce Committee has had jurisdiction of civil aviation since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. The Commerce Committee has had a subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], devoted exclusively to the question of post-war air policy. It has been at work for at least a year. It has a complete record; it has heard all the witnesses in point; it has the obvious and logical jurisdiction over the entire subject matter, unless we propose to have chaos and confusion in respect to our dealings with this utterly serious and important subject.

I realize that military aviation has a place of great importance in the post-war situation but the subject of immediate and primary importance in respect to post-war aviation is the international situation and the domestic situation in civilian aviation. The best proof of this is the fact that the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Berle, has been to the British Isles and in conference with Lord Beaverbrook, speaking for the United Kingdom, in respect to post-war avia-

tion policies. The Clark committee to which I have referred has had long conferences with Assistant Secretary Berle. We who are related to the Commerce Committee and to the Clark subcommittee feel that it is a serious interruption of the work which has almost reached its conclusion to have the Murray joint resolution detoured to a committee which has never had any jurisdiction whatever over this phase of the matter.

I am therefore presenting my request not only in the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] but I am reenforced by the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who also is unable to be present today, and I am further reenforced by a telegram from the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] who has probably had more to do with aviation legislation than any other Member of the Senate and who asserts his belief that the joint resolution should go to the Commerce Committee rather than to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to place myself in hearty accord with the statement made by the eminent Senator from Michigan. While I am a member of the Commerce Committee, and have been for a number of years, I am not a member of the subcommittee dealing with the subject matter of the joint resolution which was introduced by the senior Senator from Montana and referred to the Military Affairs Committee. I have, however, been in long distance communication with the very able chairman of the Commerce Committee, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who feels that, in view of the fact that the Commerce Committee has at all times had jurisdiction of the subject matter of this legislation and has been making an extensive study of it through the workings of the subcommittee, the joint resolution should be referred to the Commerce Committee and was improperly referred to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. REYNOLDS] is not present; the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is not present; the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is not present. It therefore seems to me, as acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that I should make a statement in regard to the request made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I am very glad to have him make his statement, but I want to preface what he is about to say as a matter of record by stating that I presented this entire matter by letter yesterday to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] so that he would be on

full notice as to what I was about to undertake.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I may say further that the committee understands that, because the clerk of the Commerce Committee came to the Military Committee and made this request on behalf of the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, I shall not resist in any way the request of the Senator from Michigan. I think, however, I should say, in behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and also in behalf of the committee—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will not in any way disagree with the statement—first, that the Senate ought to be given notice that the Senator from Montana is not here and that I am acting without consultation with him, although the Senator from Michigan has mentioned that he has consulted with the Senator from Montana; second, as the courtesy would be extended to the Foreign Relations Committee of consulting that committee if for example, the Commerce Committee wanted to report a measure affecting the international aviation situation, I think, as acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee I should ask—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will grant the request—that whenever any bill is reported the Committee on Military Affairs will have a chance to consider those parts of the bill which affect military aviation before they are reported to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is a perfectly appropriate request and meets with my entire approval. On that basis, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 146 and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, supplementing the statement of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the appropriate place a copy of the letter sent by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] chairman of the Commerce Committee, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Aeronautics, to the President regarding the current aviation situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
August 19, 1944.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The profound significance of international air transport in the post-war world has led the Committee on Commerce of the Senate to appoint a subcommittee to consider appropriate changes in legislation dealing with this subject in order to assure the position of the United States in post-war air transport overseas.

The subcommittee has been holding extended hearings throughout the past year with thorough presentation of all points of view from Government officials and agencies concerned and also from various private interests involved.

We have been advised by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board that there are now pending before the Board approximately 500 applications for authority to operate domestic service within the territorial limits of the continental United States, as well as some 100 applications for authority to operate internationally or overseas between the United States and its territories; also, that the Board has denied the application for approval of the control of American Export Airlines, Inc., by American Export Lines, Inc., a surface carrier. This decision seems sound and in line with the long-established policy of Congress, that one form of transport shall not control a competitive form of transport.

The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached: Whether there should be any change in United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American flag air lines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted.

The question of whether or not the United States should now modify its historic position as to sovereignty of the air above its borders and to what extent the United States may wisely go in subscribing to the various doctrines being proposed that contemplate general agreements with another nation or group of nations concerning freedom of the air or freedom of innocent transit seems to the committee to invite the most careful consideration by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and particularly of those concerned with the determination of policy.

Whether or not operating franchises in foreign countries should in general continue to be secured by direct application of the American flag air line concerned or through governmental negotiations is also pressing for a decision. Prior to the war operating franchises in approximately 50 foreign countries and colonies had been granted to the American flag air line system by the foreign governments concerned. The advantages or disadvantages of any change in this previously prevailing practice may well be weighed carefully.

All the evidence before the committee has indicated that approximately 75 percent of international air travel may be expected to be of United States origin. Under these circumstances the United States would seem to be entitled to expect a position of pre-eminence in international air operation.

In the special report of the Civil Aeronautics Board on international air transport policy under date of April 12, 1944, it is recommended that the governmental agreements suggested "should place no limitation on the total volume of operation on particular routes agreed upon." The consequences of such a policy, if adopted, seem to the committee to offer great dangers to the development of United States international air transport. Under such a policy under the lower operating costs of foreign carriers with lower wage levels traffic of United States origin might well come to be monopolized by foreign flag lines to the very great preju-

dice of the national interests of the United States.

International air transport commenced at the conclusion of the last war in 1919. For the first few years competition abroad existed between air lines of the same nationality. This competition between international air lines of the same nationality soon gave way in most countries to a system of zone monopolies whereby competition was restricted to foreign-flag services. Prior to the Second World War, however, all the principal foreign trading nations had entirely abandoned competition abroad between their own air lines and had also given up even their zone monopolies. Without exception, they had merged their international air transport operations into single national air-line systems or chosen instruments to strengthen their competitive position in the field of international air transport. In the United States a similar development had occurred, although without formal legislative declaration but as a result of administrative action under existing law. As a result in the last decade the United States system came to lead the world in route mileage and in commercial service.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has indicated certain routes that it considers to be in the national interest and consideration of operations on these routes is now being urged.

Whether or not American international air transport should follow the pattern that has been adopted by all principal foreign trading nations, or should develop several independent systems, each to serve a separate trade area abroad, presents a question of policy for legislative as well as executive consideration.

A number of important American companies concerned with air as well as surface transportation have presented the advantages of creating a community company to represent the United States effort abroad in which all transportation interests able to contribute by air, sea, and land may pool their resources and facilities to present a united and coordinated air transport system to meet the undoubted severe competition of other nations that the United States must face in the post-war period and American labor organizations have shown great interest in the advantages of such a plan.

The alternative proposal is for what would approximate regional monopolies serving the principal world areas originating air traffic, with competition supplied by foreign air lines.

The Commerce Committee concerned with this situation are very appreciative of the cooperation of the various Government agencies and the advice which have been received regarding the pending situation and prospective developments.

The committee will appreciate continuing to be kept advised, and meanwhile would request that no action be taken regarding international air transport applications for new routes or acquisition of existing service outside the continental United States and Canada until full consideration of Government policy can be had by Congress.

The Civil Aeronautics Board advises the committee "that if an important international proceeding should be concluded within 8 months from the time it started, we would feel that a very satisfactory time schedule had been maintained."

In view of this time lag, the committee feels no prejudice to the national interest would be involved in deferring definitive decision on international applications until the Congress shall have had opportunity for considering all phases of the situation and for taking such legislative action as might then seem wise.

The committee further feels that any hearings at this time on applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity for overseas or foreign service should be with the

full understanding by all concerned that certain changes in policy may occur and that no action should be taken which would complicate the situation or prejudice the ultimate decision by the legislative authorities concerned with policy. The committee is in full accord with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the other executive agencies concerned in recognizing the advisability of "active consideration of the question of the over-all policy relating to our very important international air transportation services."

This letter is being forwarded to you as the final authority under existing law on the issuance of certificates for the operation of United States air lines in overseas and international transportation. A copy is being forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board, who must approve applications for acquisition or mergers of American-flag carriers in the international field.

Cordially yours,

JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
KENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Civil Aeronautics.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY—AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2065) to establish a Surplus War Property Administration, to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 322), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the special committee authorized by Senate Resolution 263, Seventy-eighth Congress, to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various Presidential candidates, Vice Presidential candidates, and candidates for the United States Senate, and facts relating thereto, is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$40,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purpose.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE HOG, CATTLE, POULTRY, AND DAIRY INDUSTRIES SITUATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with further reference to Senate Resolution 309, submitted by me for myself and a number of other Senators on June 15 last, which asks for an investigation into the livestock and feeding and distribution operations, I present a letter written by Mr. Louis Kavan, of Omaha, Nebr., general secretary of the Federation of Nebraska Retailers, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, Senate Resolution 309, as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 309

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to

make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining—

(1) the conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of livestock, livestock feed, poultry, eggs, milk, and the products thereof;

(2) the effect of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) any practices wherein processors and distributors of such commodities are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(4) reasons for the failures to support prices to producers as required by existing law;

(5) alleged adverse effects of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly the extent to which livestock feeders have been penalized because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock;

(6) alleged adverse effects upon the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries of the price and other policies relative to corn and other feed grains and the maladjustments resulting therefrom.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FEDERATION OF NEBRASKA RETAILERS,

Omaha, Nebr., August 5, 1944.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is a known fact that for the past several months large chain-food corporations have been taking over a number of slaughtering plants in various sections of the United States. While quota restrictions were in force, these chain-owned slaughtering plants were forced to comply with certain regulations as to distributing meat within the territories formerly supplied by the slaughtering plant when individually owned. Since quota restrictions have been taken off, these chain slaughtering plants have increased considerably the number of animals slaughtered, and in all probability are diverting most of the finished product to their own retail outlets. This in itself can create very serious conditions for the civilians living in the territories formerly supplied by privately owned slaughtering plants, and it can aid materially into the broadening of black markets.

The chains are placed into an advantageous position by owning their own slaughtering plants, as irrespective of the amount of losses, they at least will have a supply of meat for their retail stores. The greatest injustice, however, both to the livestock raiser and to

the civilian is that these chain-owned and operated slaughtering plants are only interested in the better grade of animal. They will seek to purchase only animals that will grade good or choice. They are not interested in canners and cutters, cows, and lower grades, therefore they place an added burden upon the large packers who, if they are to buy better grades of beef, are forced to bid a higher price in competition with the chain slaughterer. Livestock producers of this country are no doubt being penalized since the inception of chain slaughtering plants. On the other hand, if the large packers are forbidden, under the packers' consent decree, to own and operate retail outlets, then the same legal provision should be made to apply in the case of chain stores.

An immediate investigation should be made and measures taken to correct this unfair condition before the American farmer and civilians are forced to suffer unnecessarily.

Yours for victory,

LOUIS KAVAN, Secretary.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 94, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 55,000 additional copies of Public Law No. 346, current session, entitled "Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944," of which 45,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

APPRAISEMENT OF THE CHICAGO DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Appraisal of the Chicago Convention," delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels to the Kiwanis Club at Raleigh, N. C., on August 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA ON MAJOR BILLS AND OTHER MEASURES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE, LABOR, AND NATIONAL DEFENSE, AND ON VETOED BILLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the votes cast by him on major bills, resolutions, and amendments with respect to agriculture, labor, and national defense, and on vetoed bills, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE—ARTICLE BY JUSTICE HOMER HOCH

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Electing a President of the United States," by Justice Homer Hoch, of the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "M. V. A. Goes to the Senate," dealing with the proposed Missouri Valley authority, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1944 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM BY JOHN B. ELLIOTT

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "War Calls for Candor—Republican Platform Fails," by John B. Elliott, being an analysis of the 1944 Republican platform, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE AND THE MOVING PICTURE "WOODROW WILSON"

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, when the George reconversion bill recently was passed by the Senate, I stated my opinion that it would prove woefully defective in meeting the impact of post-war readjustment. I am still of that opinion and I hope that before our economy has imposed upon it the stress and strain that must come from cessation of war production we will more wisely prepare for the dynamic age into which soon we will be engulfed.

But I think that one may turn from our present failure in the domestic field to the international arena with a feeling of high optimism and courage. Great events are in the making at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and a world that is sick of war and anarchy should find inspiring hope as the mighty dream of Woodrow Wilson for world security, peace, and justice is being forged into implemented reality. The Dumbarton Conference was called by the United States Government under the leadership and direction of Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull; it fulfills the prophetic vision of Woodrow Wilson; it is the first formal move to carry out the Moscow Declaration which obligated the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and China to create "a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The Senate of the United States by an almost unanimous vote has already endorsed the findings of the Moscow Conference, and I think we may safely assume will likewise approve the treaty that will develop out of it and through the present and succeeding conferences of the great and small nations.

It is difficult to think of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference—which today is earnestly seeking for the best kind of a league of nations—without thinking also of Woodrow Wilson, whose prophetic vision after the last war saw the vital need of one, and whose courageous heart and body were broken in his struggle to attain it.

I take some pride because one of the movie companies of my State—the Twentieth Century-Fox—has recently completed and released a mighty, historical film portraying the life of Woodrow Wilson. Some Army officials, seeing this production, were immediately convinced that it was propaganda of a political nature and hastily announced a ban against its showing at our military camps. That ban, improperly and irregularly announced, was almost at once withdrawn, as there never was any justification for it.

So far as I have read what they have had to say, critics proclaim the picture Wilson not only great art and entertainment, but likewise historically true to an amazing degree. But it may well be that historical fact, sincerely and dramatically portrayed, may be the most persuasive of arguments moving us to energetic and determined action. Indeed, I think that is true of this epic film Wilson, and that almost everyone who sees it will leave the theater with a greater understanding of the profound vision of this great American President, and a stronger determination that the noble ideals and ideas for which he died shall now prevail.

I believe that when the victorious soldiers and sailors of the Allies again return from distant seas and foreign battlefields they will find a world in which orderly rule is firmly entrenched to maintain peace and honor among all nations everywhere.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there are pending on the calendar two bills, House bill 3961 and Louse bill 4485, the first relating to river and harbor improvement legislation and the other to flood control. It was my privilege and honor to report both bills to the Senate from the Committee on Commerce. It has been my desire and it is still my desire to have both bills taken up as promptly as possible under all circumstances. Both bills have been acted upon by the House. Extensive hearings were held with respect to the river and harbor bill and also with respect to the flood-control bill in committee in the House, and the House passed both bills and sent them to the Senate.

When the bills came to the Senate they were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and were sent to a subcommittee of that committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and quite prolonged hearings were held with respect to both measures. The river and harbor bill was reported to the Senate on May 25, and the flood-control bill was reported to the Senate on June 22 of this year.

Mr. President, a number of Senators have from time to time asked me when the two bills were coming up for consideration. I am receiving numerous communications from individuals throughout the United States who are interested in both measures and who want to know when they are going to be disposed of. Representatives of the press call on me daily to ascertain at what time the bills will come before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. President, I realize that we shall shortly have before us important post-war legislation which we must dispose of. I refer to the bill dealing with the disposal of surplus property, which will be reported today, and I presume will come up for consideration tomorrow. I know that that bill necessarily will have precedence over the proposed river and harbor and flood-control legislation. But the people generally throughout the United States are very much interested in the bills dealing with river and harbor

improvements and flood control, and I desire, Mr. President, to ascertain from the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is representing the majority leader, and who, I presume, has consulted with the majority leader with reference to both bills, and from the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, their views concerning when the bills can be taken up and considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Louisiana has well said, of course, the important bills which deal with making plans and preparations for the post-war period must be considered and disposed of first. As the Senator from Louisiana has intimated the Senate will very likely tomorrow take up the bill dealing with the disposition of surplus property. How long it will take the Senate to consider and finally act on that bill, of course, no one can prophesy. As we know, the House has taken an unusual length of time to consider the proposed legislation. Many amendments have been offered to the bill now pending in the House. So, as I have said, no one can tell how long it will take the Senate to act on the proposed legislation.

Then, of course, after the bill shall have been passed by the two Houses it will have to go to conference, and a conference report will have to be acted upon.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, the George bill is now pending in the Ways and Means Committee of the other House. Of course, that bill will have to be finally disposed of.

I may say that I talked with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a day or two before he was compelled to leave the city. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, there is no better friend of river and harbor improvements or flood-control development than the Senator from Kentucky. His whole record is one of consistent and enthusiastic support of such developments. But it was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky, when I last talked with him, that in view of the urgency of the post-war legislation and in view of the fact that there was at least one highly controversial matter involved in the river and harbor bill, a matter which might provoke long and protracted debate, he hardly thought it would be possible to take up that bill at the present time. It was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky that very likely both bills would have to go over until after November 7. Of course, the Senator from Louisiana is far more familiar than I am with the fact that there is a highly controversial issue involved in those bills, an issue which would be hard fought, long fought, and would cause protracted debate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Alabama if it is contemplated that during the 2½ months which will elapse between now and November 7 the Senate will remain

in session, or whether a long recess is anticipated. If we are to remain in session, I can see no justification for the postponement of these bills until after election. The proposed legislation is important. Last Friday, in discussing the proceedings of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I expressed my interest on the floor of the Senate. I am most anxious that this legislation be given consideration as soon as that having precedence over it by reason of its importance is out of the way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that I share his desire for prompt action on those bills. I have a very deep interest in their passage.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the Senator has.

Mr. HILL. However, I believe it was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky that after disposing of the bills dealing with post-war matters, namely, the George bill and the surplus-property disposition bill, which the Senate will take up for consideration tomorrow, the Senate would perhaps then be in recess, unless something unforeseen should occur, or unless something urgent should be presented to the Senate for action. After disposing of the bills to which I have referred, I believe it was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate would be in recess until after November 7.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the program, and if that plan is to be followed, I, for one, would like to see those measures made a special order of business immediately following the reconvening of the Senate after November 7. River and harbor and flood-control legislation is imperative. The bills must not be permitted to die on the calendar. We are undertaking to enact bills providing huge funds for unemployment compensation. Our first duty is to provide employment; and if we fail in our duty to enact constructive measures which would be beneficial to the Nation, and which would develop our resources, then we must take the responsibility for having to provide what I should regard in many cases as unnecessary unemployment compensation—unnecessary because of our failure to meet our obligations to provide for public-works projects which would enhance the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I find myself very much in accord with what the Senator from Arkansas has said. The point which he makes is very well taken. We are undertaking to provide employment in the post-war period. Both the measures to which I refer provide for employment in connection with river and harbor and flood-control projects, even before the cessation of hostilities, under certain circumstances with which Senators who have read the bills are familiar. It is not necessary for me to go into them.

It has been said that there is one controversial item in the bills. There are two or three controversial items. In view of that fact, I think it is very important

that a day certain be set, if possible, for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bills.

I realize the situation in which the able Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, find themselves. Realizing what the situation is, I do not feel that I could successfully oppose the suggestion to take up both bills after November 7; but if possible I should like to have a day fixed for their consideration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I find myself very much in accord with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Louisiana, namely, that these bills must not be permitted to die on the calendar. They must be acted upon by the Senate, with final action by the Congress during the present session of Congress.

The Senator from Kentucky will undoubtedly return to the city shortly. The Senate will be in session, considering the war property disposal bill and the George bill, for some days to come. I think it is very probable that the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Arkansas can reach some understanding with the Senator from Kentucky to fix a day certain for the consideration of those bills.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Louisiana was good enough to express an interest in my view about the situation, and I am very glad to state my present view.

I believe that for the immediate present the situation is substantially as the Senator from Alabama has stated. We have pending two measures of great importance having to do with reconversion and post-war problems. One is pending before a Senate committee and will soon be reported to the Senate. The other is pending in a committee of the House and I am advised that it will be reported to the House in a very short time, perhaps within 2 or 3 days. If my judgment about the situation is good, I think it will be at least 2 weeks before the two measures to which I have referred, which have to do with the post-war period, are ultimately disposed of. In my view it would be quite impossible to deal with the river and harbor bill, the flood control bill, or the highway bill within that time. I believe that we should wait until the pending legislation is out of the way before we undertake to come to any conclusions about new legislation.

There is some question as to whether these subject matters ought to be dealt with separately, or whether, instead, there should be an over-all public-works program which would embody the various proposals for flood control, highways, and river and harbor improvements, and possibly other opportunities to provide work to those who may need work in the post-war days. Some Senators have that view about the matter. I am not sure that they are not correct. But certainly the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill have in them

much of a controversial nature. We cannot take up those measures immediately. When the immediate pressure is released, and when we shall have disposed of the pending post-war problems so far as legislation can dispose of them, I expect that we shall have a very meager attendance in this body, and perhaps no attendance at all in the other body until the election is out of the way.

So if I may presume to offer advice, it is that the matter be allowed to remain as it now is until we shall have reconvened after the election. We can then determine, in the light of the circumstances at that time, what ought to be done about those measures.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I feel some concern over the statement made by the Senator from Maine. He indicates that probably we ought to allow the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, which have been on the calendar for some time, to go over until legislation can be prepared in reference to other public works and improvements, so that the various subjects may be taken up either in one grand and glorious bill, or considered one after the other. Both these bills are ready for action.

Mr. WHITE. I stated I believed there was a substantial view of that sort in this body.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not wish for a moment to appear to lend any countenance to that view, because I think it is wholly fallacious.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. VANDENBERG addressed the chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana on his anxiety and his efforts to obtain consideration for these bills. I realize the difficulties suggested by the Senator from Alabama; but it seems to me that these bills ought not to be deferred or sidetracked until some more comprehensive public-works bill, as suggested by the Senator from Maine, may be brought forth. There is an element of public employment involved in both measures. The bills have been well considered. My State is deeply interested in both of them. I hope the Senator from Louisiana may be successful in obtaining as early consideration as possible under the circumstances. I merely wish to reenforce what he has said.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that in discussing this question we confront a condition, and not a theory. One of the controversies involved in the river and harbor bill, the Missouri Valley controversy, monopolized the attention of his own committee for 2 or 3 weeks, almost day and night. I anticipate that it will be equally monopolizing when it reaches the attention of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In addition, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] has given notice that he intends to attach the St. Lawrence seaway project to the river and harbor bill. I do not need to remind Senators that that would require at least a day or two of discussion.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the Senator must find 5 or 6 clear weeks before he can hope to have his river and harbor bill reach a conclusion, unless the Missouri River problem and the Central Valley problem in California can be compromised on some amicable basis before we begin.

There are many things in the river and harbor bill which I cordially agree ought to be acted upon. There are other things in the river and harbor bill which, in my opinion, ought to be thrown out the window. But in striving to anticipate a program, I respectfully suggest to the Senator that as things now stand, it will be exceedingly difficult to reach a conclusion in respect to the river and harbor bill unless there is a very substantial amount of time available for discussion.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for reinforcing my argument. The sooner we get to both bills, the better it will be, for the reasons he stated.

I promised to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Burton]. I am very glad to yield to him. He has been a very helpful and industrious member of the subcommittee which attended the hearings, and was in daily attendance and gave very careful thought to every project in the bill. I now yield to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it is as a member of the subcommittee that I wish to say just a word, because it seems to me that here we have two well-thought-out programs for post-war work. There is no question that in both bills there is a great volume of instances with respect to which the engineers have approved and worked out programs which will be of constructive value to the Nation. Under those circumstances it would be tragic if there were delay in approving this valuable program, and if we were to go ahead with something less valuable. It would be even more tragic if we failed entirely to adopt any program of river and harbor improvement and flood control. Therefore, I am in entire agreement with the Senator from Louisiana in urging the earliest possible consideration of both these bills, and as separate bills.

It seems to me that while there are controversies as to the rivers and harbors bill, they relate only to particular projects in it. It will not take long to dispose of that particular bill.

As to the flood-control bill, I believe it will take considerable time to dispose of it unless some compromise can be reached on the Missouri River project. But I believe the intervening time can well be spent in attempting to reach agreement on that.

Therefore, I hope it will be possible to work out an agreement as to the time when these two important bills can be considered and acted upon. I agree that a definite date should be set down for bringing up the river and harbor bill

first, if possible, because I believe these national projects should be approved, and that the projects should be ready to be put into operation at the earliest possible date when they shall be needed. There are so many projects which are not worth spending money on that it seems to me these projects, which have the benefit of approval by the Army engineers and which have been favorably acted upon by the House and are ready for action by the Senate, should be promptly acted on by the Senate. The Senate should not be the body which fails to provide for valuable and desirable post-war projects of that kind.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Louisiana has correctly stated my view. Coming from the Missouri River region, as I do, I know that the people there are interested in both the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, as is evidenced by a resolution adopted by the Governors of nine States, in meeting at Omaha, Nebr., on August 5 and 6. With the Senator's permission, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the resolution adopted by the Governors of the Missouri River States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE TO SECURE A BASIN-WIDE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

We, the Governors of the States in the Missouri River Basin, namely: Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri, and the members of the Missouri River States Committee, meeting at Omaha, Nebr., on August 5 and 6, 1944, after hearing and conferring with representatives of various Federal agencies, including the United States Army Engineer Corps and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, do now firmly and earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States to give force and effect to the following conclusions:

1. That in dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin it be recognized that we are dealing with one river and one problem.
2. That in approaching that problem and in order to serve all the people of the basin to the maximum possible degree and to safeguard their present established rights and their future development and prosperity, there can be no piecemeal legislative program.
3. That there must be an over-all comprehensive plan and suitable legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States which will accomplish that purpose.
4. That the omnibus flood-control bill, insofar as it deals with the Missouri River, furnishes the framework for flood control and related purposes.
5. That authorization of the Bureau of Reclamation plan now before Congress and embodied in the Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is necessary to a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin.
6. That those provisions of the Rivers and Harbors omnibus bill which relate to navigation on the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, vitally affect the economic life and

plans for future development of the entire Missouri River Basin.

7. That to develop the basin fully and for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States of America, the Congress of the United States should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin and their economic destiny and that of the United States of America.

8. That in order to accomplish this unity of purpose and action we ask the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the United States Army engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation to bring before the Congress a coordinated plan, based on the proposed legislation and official documents heretofore mentioned which will make possible the authorization by the Congress, now, of the Missouri River basin development program in its entirety by such amendments to legislation now pending as are feasible from the standpoint of legislative procedures.

The foregoing was unanimously adopted by the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. The representatives of the State of Iowa being absent at the time, the vote of that State was not recorded.

Thereupon the meeting considered the following statement:

Nothing done in the interests of flood control or navigation shall adversely affect the use of water for irrigation west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

This statement was agreed to by the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. The representatives of the State of Iowa being absent, the vote of that State was not recorded. The State of Missouri being present and represented did not choose to join in the last-mentioned statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should also like to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his interest in the matter of having both these bills taken up for early consideration. I endorse what he said; and because I come from a section of the country which is vitally interested in both bills, I, too, should like to have a definite date set, if possible, for their consideration.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], that we might tentatively agree on some date in November. I assure him that if on account of much more pressing legislation those bills could not be taken up then, I should be very glad indeed to cooperate, as I have always endeavored to do. But the people of my State and a number of Senators—in fact, practically all of them—are very anxious to know definitely, if they can, when this proposed legislation will be considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that if he will be patient for a day or two, I am quite certain the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, will be back, and at that time I will be glad to join with him in an effort to make certain that these bills are passed during this session of Congress, and that final congressional action is taken on them, so that they may become law during the present

session. I shall be glad to join with the Senator in that effort.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.
INTERNATIONAL PEACE MACHINERY—
THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on yesterday there convened at Washington, at Dumbarton Oaks, a notable international conference. Representatives of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain have met in what may be called exploratory conversations respecting the structure of international peace machinery to effect what we hope will affect all the nations of the earth, the great nations as well as the small ones.

Mr. President, it is somewhat difficult to realize the tremendous significance of such a meeting. Personally, I think we stand at the crossroads. I think the outcome of this conference will mean either that we shall go forward in the establishment of peace machinery or that we shall miserably fail in one of the greatest undertakings with which the Nation has ever been confronted.

The story of the efforts of the United States toward world peace afford an interesting background of what is now presented. Recently I have been reading about the establishment of what was known as the League to Enforce Peace, which antedated the World War. Some of the most notable men in the United States took part in the establishment of that organization. It did a great deal toward crystallizing public sentiment and stimulating thought along the lines of what was called an enforced peace.

I shall not dwell upon the transactions of 1919 and 1920. I believe that all the world has now come to the conclusion that unless we are to look forward in the next generation to another world war, brought on by ambition, resentment, anger, and hatred, perhaps on the part of those who may be conquered in the pending war—unless we wish to look forward to that kind of eventuality it behooves the people of the United States and of all the world, for that matter, wholeheartedly to join in the effort to create, establish, and maintain international peace machinery.

Mr. President, we cannot, of course, hope to create an agency which will be pleasing to everyone in all its details. Some will take exception to this, that, or the other. That would not be unnatural. When the Constitution of the United States was established there was disagreement over some of its provisions. There were notable contests in the conventions of several States over the ratification or nonratification of the product of the Convention of 1787. I recall that in the Virginia convention great figures like Patrick Henry, George Mason, and others resisted ratification, and it was finally achieved by a margin of only 10 votes. The same situation prevailed in the conventions of some of the other States.

So, Mr. President, as we approach the work of the present conference which, in the course of due time, will be followed by another conference on a higher level, I hope the people of the United States, and particularly Members of the Senate

and of the House of Representatives, will work together in peace and in unity, looking forward to the larger concept of the organization.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I wish to pay my sincere tribute to the Republican members of the committee for their approach to the present problem. There was no evidence of partisanship in the work which they have done. There was no evidence of pettifoggery. There was no disposition to inject matters of factional or partisan consideration.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was composed of the chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I am deeply grateful to each member for their patriotic and arduous labors in conference with the Secretary of State and in committee. I particularly wish to express my sense of gratitude to the Senators who represented the minority on the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. For approximately 6 months they labored in framing and presenting to the Senate the resolution which was adopted by the Senate on November 5, 1943. Irrespective of party affiliations, that resolution has met with widespread approval throughout the United States. It does not, of course, undertake to go into all the details, activities, and aspects of the proposed organization, but in a large way it lays before the people of the United States and of the world the basic structure and considerations which such an organization should embrace.

I wish also to pay my respects to those Republicans who in the Mackinac resolution at an early date labored well and handsomely toward creating what, according to their minds, was a workable and satisfactory structure of a peace organization.

Mr. President, I wish also to express my deep sense of gratitude to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE.] They were members of the subcommittee to which I have made reference, and they labored long and arduously. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] also participated in conferences with the Secretary of State. He is now a useful member of the committee.

In addition to the work which was performed in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, almost weekly during a period of nearly a year we consulted with the Secretary of State in regard to the approaching difficulties which were to be presented. In all those conferences there was no partisanship; there was no effort to obtain a partisan advantage; and there was no effort to waylay and attack from the flank anything which we were undertaking to do.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the spirit which I have attempted to describe may continue. I am sure that it will continue.

I wish to express my sense of appreciation to the authors of the original so-called B.H. resolution, Senate Resolution 114. I wish particularly to pay my sincere appreciation to those Senators because I realize their sincerity and their earnestness. While the subcommittee did not wholly agree with the resolution in its essential details, it did agree with the great objective which the sponsors of the resolution had in mind. There was no difference in the ambition of any of us to bring about one great concrete result, namely, the creation of an instrumentality by which questions could be tested not by swords and cannon, but by logic and reason. In the event a decision were to be made that there must be no aggression by those who would seek by force of arms and might to overrun their peaceful neighbors, it was intended that an organization should be created which would have sufficient power and force to prevent the conditions against which we were inveighing.

I believe that by now practically all elements of our people have arrived at the opinion that an international organization must be endowed with a sufficient armed force—naval and military—to prevent the occurrences which have resulted in this terrible and tragic war.

Mr. President, the three great countries which, through their representatives, are now holding conferences have, of course, been in conference over a considerable period of time by personal contact as well as by correspondence. It is very gratifying to witness the fine spirit which seems to actuate them at the present moment. A little later representatives of China will be called into conference. After the preliminary conversations shall have come to an end a conference on a higher level will be convened, and in due time representatives of all the people of the nations of the world, however small their territories may be, will be called into conference in order that the small nations shall have a voice and a representation in the peace machinery. After all, Mr. President, the small and weak nations are the ones which will receive the greatest benefits from such an organization as the one being proposed. As a rule they are more often attacked by the more powerful, the more aggressive, and those who are ambitious to achieve military mastery, than are the great and strong powers.

Mr. President, in the liquidation of this war after it shall have come to an end it will not be practicable immediately to conclude a treaty of peace. Pending a definite treaty of peace it may be necessary for the four great powers participating on the Allied side to maintain contact and concert of action in bringing about control and supervision in enemy countries. We cannot permit chaos and anarchy to break out in any of the countries which have been overrun and occupied. We cannot permit those conditions to obtain even in the enemy countries. So far as the war itself is concerned the great powers must continue

to act in harmony. It does not follow, however, as a result that the permanent peace structure which we hope to set up will in any way be modified.

Mr. President, I am sure that Secretary Hull and those associated with him in this enterprise welcome conferences with any one who has a thought to suggest and who will come to them in a spirit of helpfulness and cooperation. I am sure that that is their attitude. It is the attitude of our Committee on Foreign Relations and its subcommittee. We want suggestions from any source, provided they come in a spirit of helpfulness and not in one of enmity and a determination to obstruct the processes of the conference.

So the prospects of the conference's successful outcome are very propitious, indeed. There seems to prevail a spirit of cooperation, of good will, and a desire to unite in the creation of the peace structure.

Mr. President, I do not think, however, that our people should be led to the conclusion that this war is already over, because it is not. While reports from the battlefields of Europe have been very impressive and inspiring, while they have offered much hope of an early termination of the war, we cannot afford to relax one inch; we cannot let anything cause us to recede from the aggressive militant spirit that will be required to win this war. We hope in due course, however, to establish an agency which will offer hope to the peoples of the earth, which will offer hope to the small and the weak nations, which will offer hope to the nations who entertain peaceful ambitions, and will offer condemnation to nations that entertain visions of conquest of their neighbors or the overrunning of the world and the establishment of military monarchies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is chairman of a committee of the House and Senate, I think, which has been conferring with Secretary Hull regarding the general character of the post-war peace organization?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I am not chairman of the joint committee. I am chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, but groups from both House and the Senate for over a considerable period have conferred with Secretary Hull.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested to know whether that committee is sitting in on the Dumbarton Oaks Conference or whether they are keeping in touch with it or keeping advised of it, or what the status is. What is the relation of the committee created by Congress with the present Dumbarton Oaks Conference?

Mr. CONNALLY. The present conference does not include members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. The present group is more of a meeting of technicians concerned with the physical integration of what the larger policy that is indicated to them might be. However, I shall say to the

Senator from Ohio that I have had up with the Secretary of State the matter of our being kept informed, and I have assurances that daily, if necessary, and from time to time the Committee on Foreign Relations will be kept advised of the progress of these negotiations and of any matter of sufficient importance to attract the attention of the committee. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. In a way, then, the committee is on a higher level than those who are conferring; and when the conference reaches a higher level, then the committee of the Senate will participate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that that is true. The Senator is aware of the fact, of course, that in the United States the custom has always been for the Executive to handle the negotiations and that the matters were simply submitted to the Senate at a later time. I wish to say to the Senator that Mr. Hull and his associates have not taken that position. They have evidenced a desire to have the cooperation of and to cooperate with the Senate, and while we perhaps may not be members even of the higher level, it might overbalance the representation from other countries if that happened—we will be kept advised; we will have access to the Secretary of State, and, if necessary, to other functionaries connected with the matter. I have no fear that there will be any sort of ignoring of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I say a word at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I owe it to the Secretary of State to add at this point that he personally communicated with me, representing the minority group of the special committee, and personally placed at my disposal any information I may seek at any time regarding any phase of the Dumbarton Oaks conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator from Ohio supplementing what the Senator from Michigan has said, that he called the subcommittee into conference and handed each one of its members a complete draft of what was in his mind as to the general structure of the peace organization. It was confidential; it was not given to the public; but I simply cite that fact to show the evidence of entire willingness to keep the Senate advised and to take us into confidence.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested in determining what the exact status was.

While I am on my feet, however, I should like to ask the Senator one other question. I was somewhat alarmed to read in the New York Times of Friday, August 18, what purports to be an interview with our Ambassador, Mr. W. Averell Harriman. There he is cited by a Polish newspaper in regard to a conference held with the Polish committee which was set up under the auspices of the Russian Government. I quote from the article:

It cites Mr. Harriman's declaration to the Polish National Council's representatives that

the "alliance between the United States of America and the United Soviet Socialist Republics is firm and is expected to endure for decades."

I wonder if the Senator could tell me whether there is any such alliance or whether that is a misquotation of the Ambassador's statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think that is a rhetorical flourish on the part of the Ambassador.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator thinks there is no alliance?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no alliance in the sense of any treaty or any binding commitment. I think what he means there is that as a result of this war our relations have been drawn much more closely together and that the unity and harmony to wind up the war and to liquidate it will probably be extended to the future.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator feels confident that there is no alliance of any kind, secret or otherwise?

Mr. CONNALLY. We have the assurance from the highest possible sources that there were no commitments whatever made at Moscow, Teheran, Cairo, or Casablanca that will be binding on this Government.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been very much interested in what the Senator has had to say with regard to the relations of the Secretary of State with the committees of Congress on this all-important and vital subject because I think that relationship itself may well spell the success or failure of any plan; and, from what I have heard said here, I take it that the attitude of the Secretary of State is not one of ignoring the Congress, but, on the other hand, there may be said to be a sincere attitude of complete cooperation with the appropriate committees of the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator has stated it accurately.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have been one of those who have heard from time to time with great interest and appreciation the statements which have been made on the floor by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY], and I have heard with approval his generous references to the attitude of Senators on the other side of the aisle. However, the inquiry which was made a moment ago by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the history of this body in respect to international agreements leads one to be concerned as to whether or not before we come to the point of decision on these matters we have perfected the machinery and the technique by which we propose to meet them and to handle them. It seems to me that if there is ever going to be any question raised at a subsequent time about whether the Senate has had adequate participation in these matters, the

time to raise the question is now before the deliberations proceed too far.

If, as the elder Senator Lodge ably maintained, the right of the Senate to advise includes the power and the right of the Senate to suggest and to take part in the initial deliberations and discussions, if I understand his theory correctly, and if it is a tenable theory, let us determine it before we ever have the conference and not wait until the delegates depart for their several countries and then insist that the Senate was not adequately represented. Let us determine our course and our theory and the theory of our rights and our duty, and let us advise the executive branch of the Government that we regard our power as a coordinate power not only in the ratification of these international understandings, but in their negotiation, and, having been left out of the negotiation, we feel we have been precluded from our correct and proper part.

In the second place, Mr. President, would it not be wise, if I may venture the suggestion, that the joint committee, which has been well-functioning, work out some proper way of limiting the time in committee and debate on the floor which shall be devoted to these matters, so that we can assure other powers that, within a reasonable time at least, the United States of America shall make a decision one way or the other about the matter.

I think the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Senators on both sides of the aisle would have to agree that as it is, at the present time, neither the President nor the Secretary of State can tell any foreign power or powers when the decision of the United States Government, including the action of the Senate under its power, may be expected upon an international agreement. We certainly should perfect a formula or come to some agreement respecting machinery under which action can be taken, so that no nation or group of nations will have to wait indefinitely upon the action of this branch of the Government as being necessary to the validating of agreements.

The third thing, Mr. President—and the able chairman has been most indulgent, as he always is—if there is going to be a protracted debate upon whether these agreements constitute agreements to be ratified by the Senate and the House of Representatives by majority vote, as opposed to treaties which require two-thirds vote in the Senate, can we not jointly and in a spirit of patriotism and cooperation formulate some standard, some definition, which might establish the line of demarcation between an agreement and a treaty?

Senators well know that there is an agreement now pending in the Foreign Relations Committee, the oil agreement with Great Britain, and Senators know that we shall soon be presented with the report of the monetary conference, but which has not yet come to the committee. They are matters of great importance, and there may be differences of opinion among Senators as to what the procedure with respect to them should be, and how many votes will be required in the Senate for the approval of these

agreements. That will depend upon what we determine to be the character of the agreements.

Mr. President, cannot the joint committee, under the able leadership of our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, begin to devote some attention to that matter, and consult authorities on international law, and take counsel from any worthy source, and let us determine, if we can, that those engagements which do not require a commitment to the exercise of military force on the part of this country may be regarded as agreements, subject to ratification and validation by a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House, while those engagements which would bind this country to an obligation to use force in case of unprovoked attack upon an ally, might well be regarded as treaties, requiring two-thirds vote of the Senate for their ratification?

So, respecting the matter of how many votes it will take for the validity of the instrument to be established in the Congress, respecting the question of how long we will consume in committee and on the floor in consideration and debate, and regarding the very vital matter of the proper place of senatorial representation in the whole matter, respecting those very essential and very vital matters, could not this committee bring together its members, and take counsel from appropriate sources and try to formulate something which will make it possible for the machinery of the United States Government expeditiously and properly to function and in a timely manner to function? Let us do it before it is too late.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his suggestion. We have such a large element of good spirit on both sides of the Chamber for what we hope will be an acceptable structure of peace, that I am sure we will not have any difficulty about the details. However, I shall be glad to keep in mind what the Senator has suggested.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Texas has been good enough to refer to me and others upon this side of the Chamber in most kindly fashion, and I want to express to him my very grateful appreciation of the spirit he has manifested and of the words spoken by him.

Mr. President, out of my observation of parliamentary practice there has come to me the very deep conviction that a legislative committee, whether of the House or of the Senate, never rises above the level of leadership of the chairman of the committee. I think whatever has been accomplished in the way of unity, and whatever of helpful suggestions have come from the Foreign Relations Committee during these late months, may be attributed in substantial part to the kindness, the courtesy, and the tact shown by the Senator from Texas in his

leadership of that committee. He has shown at all times consideration for those of us in the minority. He has shown wisdom, and I think, as is true since he came to the Congress many years ago, he has been motivated at all times by an exalted patriotism.

Mr. President, I have for him profound respect, and I have great confidence that under his leadership greater things will yet be accomplished in the bringing about of this international order for which we all hope.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am sincerely grateful to the Senator from Maine for these generous and kind remarks which have come as an expression of his great heart.

Mr. President, we have had this fine spirit in the committee because of the fact that the Senators I have mentioned, and others on the minority side who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the distinguished members of the majority on that committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and other Senators, all have had no other purpose on earth than a purpose of high patriotism and a desire to bring about a solution, so far as solutions can be obtained at all, of this question of international peace and the prevention of war. Were it not for the cooperation and kindly assistance of these Senators we could not have made progress, but we could very easily have had some classic joint debates, and some very outstandingly sharp differences in the committee and on the floor. It is our purpose to avoid those things.

Mr. President, the preservation of the peace, not simply for ourselves but for all the world, is something which leaps over mountain ranges; it does not stop at international boundaries, it does not stop even at the shore lines of the ocean, but it is something which reaches into the very fundamentals of humanity and humankind. Even if our instrumentality at first may not be perfect—and very few things on this earth are perfect; perfection exists only in another world than this one—even though our instrumentality may not be perfect, yet if we make substantial progress toward diminishing the danger of war and giving security and a promise of peace to the peoples of the earth, we shall achieve as no other legislative body has achieved in all the long and varied centuries that have passed over the hoary head of mother earth. Peace and the preservation of peace for the security of nations is something which is greater than partisan politics. It transcends the little temporary victories or defeats which may occur in this Chamber. It transcends political fortunes of individuals.

Mr. President, we see the lists of casualties from the European battlefields and from the far stretches of the Pacific. The War Department lists the soldier's name, lists his address, lists his organization perhaps, and perhaps it lists the names of his parents, but it does not list whether he is a Republican or

a Democrat. He is fighting for the Republic. He is fighting for his native land. He is fighting for his flag. He is not fighting for any puny political consideration, Democratic or Republican.

So, Mr. President, I hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle, and Members of the House, may continue not alone in their attitude of approaching these problems in a nonpartisan spirit, but I hope they will use their influence and their power upon those who may be inclined to make the question a political one, not to do so, but let the United States of America continue the leadership. We have taken it; let us maintain it. Let us accomplish this great ambition of giving to the world a leadership which shall secure the establishment of peace machinery that shall offer at least a hope to the world that the generations which follow ours shall not be cursed by another bloody, cruel, and tragic war like that which has already devastated so many of the fair lands of Europe and of Asia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me say first that I cordially agree with the able and distinguished Senator from Texas in his dedication to an unpartisan approach to this tremendously vital achievement which is so desperately essential to civilization. I take it this does not suggest that candid public discussion of the subject should be foreclosed. On the contrary, I take it, that, as President Wilson once said, we should seek open covenants openly arrived at, and that it is to the best welfare of the Nation that the problems of foreign policy should be laid frankly before the American people and discussed frankly out of the heart of our high leadership, so long as the objective is the welfare of our common undertaking.

Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has said about the work of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I know of no experience in my 16 years in the Senate when there have been more generous, broad-minded, and tolerant efforts to find a unity of purpose at all times, regardless of partisan politics. I join in thanking him for his observations regarding whatever contributions we have been able to make from this side of the aisle in the same spirit.

I rise particularly, however, Mr. President, because of an implication in the suggestions made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who seems to feel that we have already reached the point where we can leap ahead to the creation of a timetable which will foreshorten this entire enterprise and produce a quick net result. I think he suggested that if anyone has any difference of opinion regarding what is going on, he ought to express it now, and not later.

Mr. President, I believe there is no fundamental difference of opinion regarding the objective. I think perhaps there is some difference of opinion among us as to the precise method which shall be pursued in arriving at that goal. In view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida I wish to take this occasion very briefly to lay down three or four fundamental points which will be

my own continuous impulse in my continuing effort in connection with this great and vital adventure.

The first thing I wish to say is that, in my view, if this foreshortened world cannot organize a permanent peace, then the murderous ingenuity of modern military science will make an end to our civilization in the next world war; and only those who are blind to these blasting realities, only those who can be complacent in the presence of global suicide, will fail to make every practical effort to organize the peace of this earth against any such calamity. To that objective I dedicate every prayer of my heart and every effort of my remaining years.

Next, Mr. President, I wish to say that, from my point of view, it is too obvious for argument that this objective requires sound international organization to encourage the concord of good will; to stimulate moral and spiritual, as well as physical defenses; to establish organized justice under effective international law as a substitute for force; to create the mechanisms which shall exhaust the rules of reason before there shall be appeals to might; and ultimately, if all these fail, to mobilize the military cooperation which shall defend the conscience of the world.

Third, I wish to say that at the threshold of this aspiration it is equally obvious that the world's criminals of today must be so permanently demilitarized that they can never become the criminals of tomorrow. To that end the immediate and continuous availability of Allied force is indispensable. This is elementary prudence. It is clearly the primary military responsibility of the four major powers. It is a temporary military alliance for a specific and limited purpose, as distinguished from a permanent alliance. Even George Washington, the great, original foe of entangled Americanism, recognized such temporary alliances as wholly legitimate. There must be no such complacency, in softer years to come, in respect to this repressive phase of the problem as was largely responsible for Hitler's sinister violation of Versailles, with the expedient and inexplicable and negligent consent of his subsequent victims.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the question as to the part which military force shall play in the ultimate authority of this international organization which is to be charged with responsibility for the peace of the world. Let there be no doubt about my view that force, as a last resort, shall never be out of sight or out of mind or out of mutual reach. Military force will always have to be the answer to those who understand no other argument. But there can be deeply conscientious differences of honest opinion in respect to the inherent relative importance of military force in this equation.

I am one of those who do not believe that our greatest hope for peace lies in trying to put peace in a steel strait jacket. I believe that our greatest hope lies in adequate mechanisms to develop reason and justice in international affairs, which shall be predominately accepted by enlightened peoples—backed always, I repeat, by constant vigilance

against mobilizations of aggressive power. In other words, I doubt whether any hard and fast international contracts looking toward the automatic use of cooperative force in unforeseeable emergencies ahead will be worth any more, when the time comes, than the national consciences of the contracting parties when the hour of acid test arrives. In whatever degree this is correct, our final reliance, even in the mobilization of military force—which, of course, must be available finally—will depend upon the justice of the cause and the peace conscience of the world.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I believe that a just peace, in the first instance, is the indispensable beginning of this great adventure, because in my view a good league cannot cure a bad peace, either now or hereafter. It is for this reason that I like those words in the Republican national platform, if I may refer to it not in a partisan sense but in a historical sense—words which have been amazingly misunderstood—which pledge the use of peace forces to stop the aggressors of tomorrow. Peace forces means to me whatever force—moral, diplomatic, economic, or military—is necessary to keep the peace whenever the emergency arises. In my humble view, the first three of these forces are likely to be more useful than the last, although the last must never be ignored and must never be unavailable.

Let me add a final word to this swift summary. I want my country to play her full, legitimate, and effective role in this evolution out of recurrent world savagery. I believe she can play her greatest role by remaining always and forever the free, sovereign, and independent United States of America. I believe that her voice will always be the most disinterested and judicial voice in the concerts of the world; and such a voice should never be muted. I believe that we can collaborate wholeheartedly in building up the "peace forces" which shall minimize, and probably prevent, another World War tragedy; and I have no thought that we have parted with any essential sovereignty when, for example, we ourselves recognize justiciable issues in a greatly broadened and strengthened international law which we ourselves have helped to write, and which we approve.

I have the profound conviction that if this international machinery is adequately created to implement a just peace, and again I emphasize the adjective, and if the major powers strive faithfully to organize and support these "peace forces" of the earth, any pirate of tomorrow who defies this process will be so clearly criminal in character and so clearly due for physical restraint that there will be no default, on the part of ourselves or of any others, in the united, voluntary military action which will produce invincible repression.

Mr. President, that, in a general quick summary, indicates my feeling about this tremendously important subject. I think it ought to be plain that the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee, to which considerable reference has been

made, in its conferences at the State Department has dealt solely with the question of international organization for peace. It has had no approach to the considerations involved in the writing of the terms of the peace itself. That has been outside our jurisdiction thus far. If there has been any sort of difference of opinion among Senators, the great difference has been over the inability of some of us to separate our conception of the international machinery which we are attempting to create from the type and character of the peace itself—the type of a post-war status quo which our organization in the first instance must underwrite and undertake to sustain. My own very deep conviction, I repeat, is that we cannot separate the possibility of final and conclusive success for our organization from the justice and the equity of the peace agreement which in the first instance it must undertake to administer.

But in the present temper of the American people and in the present approach which is being made to this subject throughout the country, if we will just credit good faith to those who want to publicly discuss the subject, I know of no reason why we should not proceed to a net result which will be a benediction on the world. I do not think there is any disadvantage in full public discussion, so long as it is well-founded and proceeds in good faith. On the contrary, I think that in the last year or two our chief difficulty has been a lack of adequate public information about some phases of the problem—a lack of information which inevitably invites gossip and rumor and speculation—a lack of information particularly regarding post-war understandings at Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, and Teheran.

Under the existing circumstances, particularly in the light of what is a very recent accord between high spokesmen for political parties in the United States respecting a mutual desire to achieve this goal, in my view the conference at Dumbarton Oaks meets under the happiest possible promise of good effect.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I am very happy about the remarks which have been made by various Senators. I especially approve what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said about public discussion of these all-important questions. I think we should have public discussion. I think every man in public life should have convictions on this great subject, and should express his convictions. So I am quite happy about the discussion.

There was one matter, however, in the course of the remarks of the Senator from Michigan which disturbed me just a little, and I wish to propound to him a question relating to it, to see whether I correctly understood him. In the course of his remarks the Senator from Michigan more than once referred to a world organization implementing the peace. His words indicated, to my mind, that perhaps the Senator from Michigan thought we should postpone discussions of such a world organization until after the peace is finally agreed

upon. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Michigan whether I misunderstood him in that respect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for asking me the question, especially if there could be the slightest doubt or implication in connection with my previous remarks. My answer to him regarding postponement of all these discussions is emphatically "No." The planning of the world peace organization should proceed at a maximum speed to a conclusion as early as circumstances and events will permit.

What I said, or at least what I meant to say, was that those who in the future must make the final decisions respecting the international organization, I think should also be highly and intimately informed, concurrently, regarding the thinking of these governments in respect to the kind of a peace which is contemplated; because, I repeat, I think there are more possible germs of future disaster in the wrong kind of a peace than there are in even the wrong kind of a league. I think the subjects are inseparable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that perhaps the question arose in my mind, not as a result of what he said, but from my own lack of understanding. But I am very glad that I asked the question, and I am deeply gratified at the explanation the Senator has given. Of course, it is in accord with my view.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make very sure that I am correctly understood. I am not one of those who think this new instrumentality should be used as the one to make the peace. I am entirely in disagreement with any such view. I think the two functions are totally unrelated.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say that I know of no one who does not take that view.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—REAM GENERAL HOSPITAL (FORMERLY THE BREAKERS HOTEL) (PT. 19 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in December of 1942, the War Department acquired the Breakers Hotel, in Palm Beach, one of America's famous luxury hotels. The hotel was taken for use as a station hospital. After about 4½ months' use, during which only a small portion of the beds were filled, the Air Corps, who were operating the station hospital, decided they had no further use for it. The hospital was then transferred to the Surgeon General for use as a general hospital, known as the Ream General Hospital. After a few more months the War Department announced that it was abandoning the Breakers Hotel. There was considerable public discussion of this, as a result of which an investigation was undertaken by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

After an investigation, including the examination of witnesses on the ground the committee arrived at the following conclusions:

The Breakers should never have been acquired. The War Department seriously underestimated its fair rental cost. It was the most expensive hotel property in the vicinity. Its advantages over other similar first-class hotels in the vicinity were primarily in luxuries.

The manner of acquisition, as in the case of other hotel properties in the Florida area, was high-handed and arbitrary. The officers in charge of the take-over acted on very short notice with practically no consideration for the owners, whereas they should have been able to give the owners sufficient notice. This occurred in many other hotel acquisitions as well. The officers in charge for the Army valued the hotel entirely too low. The owners feel an attempt was made to force them to accept these valuations by indicating that it would be unpatriotic to try to get a fair return. Other instances of similar attempts appeared in other Florida hotel acquisitions. The owners had the financial ability to resist and because of such ability they will receive a rent which is exactly twice what was first offered.

After the Breakers had been discontinued as a station hospital the decision to convert it into a general hospital was proper. The large structure had been practically empty during most of the time it was used as a station hospital. Rent and large renovation charges had been incurred. By using this very desirable property as a general hospital, the Government provided what the Surgeon General termed "a model institution," and at the same time proceeded to get something for its money.

The original decision to abandon the Breakers was made with insufficient consideration. A second decision affirming the original one was made 4 months later, after a detailed study of the question by a board of officers. As shown below this decision was not justified by the facts.

The Breakers should not have been abandoned at this time in view of the large financial obligation which was incurred. Representatives of the Surgeon General have testified that the Breakers is an excellent hospital. It has been characterized by the Surgeon General as one of his best general hospitals, and a model institution. The testimony before this committee is that the beds in the Breakers Hospital could be used. The facility itself and its location were excellent. The reasons given for its abandonment are not convincing. It appears that the property was abandoned because the War Department discovered it to have been a very poor original transaction, which resulted in a property which was bound to be too expensive. The loss would be incurred, whether or not the property was returned. The cost of keeping the property, over and above the cost of returning it, was moderate. However, pressure from civilian groups to return the Breakers Hotel, added to the fact that the entire property, taken as a whole, was a poor original investment apparently prompted the War Department to return it.

In order fully to appreciate the War Department's position in connection with the Breakers, the committee carefully

surveyed the entire hospital programs of all of the armed services, and of the Veterans' Administration. We found that none of the other services could use the Breakers Hotel. This should have been known before the Breakers was ever acquired. Unfortunately it was not.

The committee's last conclusion is as follows:

Prior to March 31, 1943, there was no coordination of the hospital programs of the various agencies. As a result, the Breakers was acquired without consultation with any of the other agencies which might have been able to utilize excess army hospitals in suitable locations. Despite the fact that on March 31, 1943, the President ordered the War Department to consult the Federal Board of Hospitalization, organized in 1924 for the purpose, the War Department did not consult the Board about the conversion to a general hospital or before the original decision was made to abandon the Breakers. After controversy had arisen, the Board was finally consulted on the abandonment.

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I submit the report and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, and without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (pt. 19 of Rept. No. 10) is as follows:

REAM GENERAL HOSPITAL, FORMERLY THE
BREAKERS HOTEL

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. The Breakers should never have been acquired. The War Department seriously underestimated its fair rental cost. It was the most expensive hotel property in the vicinity. Its advantages over other similar first-class hotels in the vicinity were primarily in luxuries.

2. The manner of acquisition, as in the case of other hotel properties in the Florida area, was high-handed and arbitrary. The officers in charge of the take-over acted on very short notice with practically no consideration for the owners, whereas they should have been able to give the owners sufficient notice. This occurred in many other hotel acquisitions as well. The officers in charge for the Army valued the hotel entirely too low. The owners feel an attempt was made to force them to accept these valuations by indicating that it would be unpatriotic to try to get a fair return. Other instances of similar attempts appeared in other Florida hotel acquisitions. The owners had the financial ability to resist and because of such ability they will receive a rent which is exactly twice what was first offered.

3. After the Breakers had been discontinued as a station hospital the decision to convert it into a general hospital was proper. The large structure had been practically empty during most of the time it was used as a station hospital. Rent and large renovation charges had been incurred. By using this very desirable property as a general hospital, the Government provided what the Surgeon General termed "a model institution," and at the same time proceeded to get something for its money.

4. The original decision to abandon the Breakers was made with insufficient consideration. A second decision affirming the original one was made 4 months later, after a detailed study of the question by a board

of officers. As shown below this decision was not justified by the facts.

5. The Breakers should not have been abandoned at this time in view of the large financial obligation which was incurred. Representatives of the Surgeon General have testified that the Breakers is an excellent hospital. It has been characterized by the Surgeon General as one of his best general hospitals, and a "model institution." The testimony before this committee is that the beds in the Breakers Hospital could be used. The facility itself and its location were excellent. The reasons given for its abandonment are not convincing. It appears that the property was abandoned because the War Department discovered it to have been a very poor original transaction, which resulted in a property which was bound to be too expensive. The loss would be incurred whether or not the property was returned. The cost of keeping the property, over and above the cost of returning it, was moderate. However, pressure from civilian groups to return the Breakers Hotel, added to the fact that the entire property, taken as a whole, was a poor original investment apparently prompted the War Department to return it.

6. In order to provide sufficient additional general hospital beds, when the Breakers was abandoned, a barracks type of hospital was placed into operation at Camp Atterbury, Ind. The location and general construction of this hospital does not compare with the Breakers.

7. If used for a redistribution center or a hospital, the Breakers could be operated at costs comparable to those of any of the hotel properties now being acquired, provided it did not charge against the cost of its operation the loss which will be incurred whether or not the property is retained. The committee has not been advised of any convincing reason why the Breakers would not be suitable for a redistribution center.

8. Prior to March 31, 1943, there was no coordination of the hospital programs of the various agencies. As a result, the Breakers was acquired without consultation with any of the other agencies which might have been able to utilize excess Army hospitals in suitable locations. Despite the fact that on March 31, 1943, the President ordered the War Department to consult the Federal Board of Hospitalization, organized in 1924 for the purpose, the War Department did not consult the Board about the conversion to a general hospital or before the original decision was made to abandon the Breakers. After controversy had arisen, the Board was finally consulted on the abandonment.

9. The War Department's statements of facts in connection with this entire matter do not appear to be accurate. For instance, the cost per bed stated by the Engineer Corps to the Surgeon General on the basis of which the Surgeon General agreed to relinquish the hotel was far in excess of later War Department estimates. Another instance is in the Engineer Corps' bed estimate of a fair rental for the property. Another is in the statements made to this committee. In a letter dated August 16, 1944, the War Department advised this committee that unless the work of reconverting the Breakers to a hotel were begun by August 21, the alterations could not be finished on December 10, when the War Department intends to return the hotel to its owners. This was stated in order to induce this committee to complete its investigation. But on April 26, 1944, the War Department advised this committee that the Breakers could be used as a hospital until September 1 and that there would still be ample time for reconversion. And the board of officers appointed by the War Department to consider the abandonment of the Breakers concluded, on the basis of positive testimony before them, that the reconversion could be completed in 2 months, including the reinstallation of the hotel furnishings. The

report of the board of officers on the abandonment of the Breakers contains many self-contradictions.

THE ACQUISITION OF THE BREAKERS HOTEL

The Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach, Fla., owned by the Florida East Coast Hotel Co., is considered one of the finest luxury hotels in America. It is a 500-room, 9-story structure with a number of large cottages, spacious grounds, and considerable ocean frontage.

In the summer of 1942 a survey was made of various buildings in Florida suitable for Army hospital use. On September 16, 1942, the Breakers Hotel was surveyed for this purpose. On this date the Breakers made inquiry of the Surgeon General's Office, through proper Government channels, and were advised that the Surgeon General's Office did not think they would be interested in Palm Beach. Nothing further occurred until September 30, when another inspection of the hotel was made by the War Department. Then nothing further occurred until November 20 when still another inspection was made.

In the meantime the owner made plans and entered into the necessary advertising arrangements, and made commitments for the employment of a staff and for other necessities with the intention of opening the hotel as usual on December 15, 1942. This was at the request of the civic authorities at Palm Beach who had urged the continued operation of the Breakers Hotel.

On December 4, 1942, the owners received a telegram to have their representative stand by with respect to the possible leasing of the hotel. This was the first information the owners had that the War Department had any intention of taking over the hotel. Prior to that there had merely been inspections of a type which had been made of practically every hotel in the Florida area. By December 4 the entire operating staff at the hotel were on the premises and arrangements to open the hotel on December 15 were well under way.

On December 7, 1942, another inspection was made and the War Department telegraphed the owners that the Government desired occupancy of the hotel. Negotiations took place on December 8 in New York, which was a Tuesday, and the officer in charge told the owners that the War Department would have to obtain possession of the premises by Thursday morning of that week, the 10th of December. On Friday morning, December 11, the War Department obtained a court order giving them possession starting December 12, 1942.

Over 90 guests were expected to arrive at the hotel on the following Tuesday, December 15. All the employees were on the job, and had contracts. There were over \$400,000 worth of reservations booked, which was only about \$50,000 below normal.

At this time there were at least two other hotels in Palm Beach which were not opening for the season beginning December 15, 1942. They were first-class hotels, one just about the size of the Breakers, the other two-thirds of its size. There was also available for use by the armed forces in West Palm Beach at that time a civilian hospital which had 200 beds and which could have been expanded to 1,200. This hospital was offered to the Navy Department and certainly could have been obtained by the War Department.

The officer in charge for the Army offered \$200,000 a year rent for the premises, before the condemnation proceedings were instituted. His manner has been characterized by the owners as arbitrary. This is in complete agreement with the statement received by the committee concerning this officer from practically every hotel owner with whom he dealt in the Florida area. The management was told "you can take it or leave it." The

management was told very strongly that public opinion would brand them as unpatriotic if they went to court in an effort to get a higher rent. It should be pointed out at this time that in a tentative agreement between the United States Government and the hotel management, for the return of the hotel to the owners the rent has been fixed at \$400,000 a year. The present rent includes minor portions of the entire Breakers property in addition to that originally taken. However, the original offer was for the basic hotel and some of the surrounding property and buildings, without which the property which was subsequently taken, was entirely valueless to the owners. Moreover, the additional property taken represented only a small portion of the whole. There is no reason to doubt that the \$400,000 rental figure is a fair figure. The Breakers was an extremely profitable and valuable hotel.

The officer in charge of the negotiations told the manager of the Breakers that the Government's haste was due to an immediate demand for facilities because a large number of wounded were expected to be evacuated from Africa. Actually the premises were not used as a hospital of any kind until March 1, 1943, when they were opened as a station hospital, with a capacity of 1,038 beds. In March there were an average of 32 occupied beds, in April an average of 29, in May an average of 127, in June an average of 221, in July an average of 200. According to the Army's own statement, "the Army Air Forces offered the Breakers Hotel to the Surgeon General for use as a general hospital on July 19, 1943, when it became apparent that reduction of Army Air Forces personnel in Florida and failure of overseas evacuations to develop made it unnecessary to retain this facility as a station hospital."

As of July 19 an obligation almost undoubtedly had been incurred to pay a full year's rent, or \$400,000 as now agreed. Two hundred and ninety-nine thousand dollars had been invested to convert the premises to a hospital. Substantially the same amount would have to be invested to convert it back to a hotel. The total is \$998,000, and after only 4½ months of partial use the Army Air Forces, which had originally taken the hotel, was through with it. As of this point, the total number of patients was 661 and the average number of beds occupied was 122, or a cost for providing the building alone, of over \$3,000 for each bed occupied.

TRANSFER OF THE HOSPITAL TO THE SURGEON GENERAL

On July 30, 1943, the Surgeon General recommended that the hospital be made available as a general hospital. On September 10, the Surgeon General assumed jurisdiction over the Breakers Hotel and operated it at a capacity of 1,038 beds. It was called the Ream General Hospital. On September 3, the Surgeon General requested alterations, modifications, and acquisition of additional grounds around the hotel, which, after modification would have totaled approximately \$400,000. This final sum was approved by the Army Service Forces on November 11, 1943. As late as December 4, 1943, at the request of the War Department, the Department of Justice obtained a court order in condemnation for the immediate possession of additional ground around the hotel. This order was never served because on the same day, 2 hours after the order was signed, the War Department changed its mind and instructed the Attorney General that it did not want the land. However, on December 4, 1943, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styer advised the hotel owners that the Chief of Engineers had been instructed to negotiate further with respect to leasing the property, and on December 6 General Styer advised the hotel owners that a study was being made of the requirements for additional land in connection with the

Breakers Hotel, and that pending the completion of the study the War Department would refrain from seeking this lease by condemnation.

In the meantime, however, the War Department had concluded "that it had become evident that an excessive rental as well as expensive alterations would be entailed." It had begun to reconsider the desirability of this property in the light of a directive of the Under Secretary of War on November 16 that all rental real estate be surveyed and that all such property not actually needed be released.

On January 8, 1944, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Army Service Forces, wrote to Mr. William R. Kenan, president, Florida East Coast Hotel Co., the owners of the Breakers, as follows:

"This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 30, 1943, in which you request information as to whether or not the War Department intends to continue the use of the Breakers Hotel, West Palm Beach, Fla., as a general hospital.

"It has now been decided that as soon as arrangements can be made for removal of the patients now at this hospital, the Breakers Hotel will be returned to its owners. The Chief of Engineers has been instructed to accomplish this transfer and will contact you directly."

THE DECISION TO ABANDON THE BREAKERS

The major reasons given for the abandonment of the Breakers are the following:

1. Excessive cost as determined by the Chief of Engineers. This item was easily determinable before the Breakers was taken.
2. A general decision to give up rental properties in favor of purchased property wherever possible. The only application to hospitals of this alleged general rule was in the case of the Breakers Hotel. No other hospital was given up on this basis. Moreover, the Breakers could have been purchased.

3. A determination that there were too many general hospitals in the southern part of the country and not enough in the northern part of the country, in view of the distribution of population. As a result of this determination, no other hospitals in the South were closed other than the Breakers.

This committee has asked the War Department for all documents bearing in any way upon the decision to abandon the Breakers Hotel. The first document of any kind indicating that the abandonment of the hotel was contemplated is an office memorandum to the Surgeon General on the subject of a conference concerning the Ream General Hospital.

This conference took place December 13, 1943. The Surgeon General's position was the following:

- (a) That minimum necessary changes be made to convert the Breakers into a suitable general hospital.

- (b) That additional land, then available, be purchased to provide exercise space for convalescent patients.

- (c) That the Surgeon General would favorably entertain a proposal to give up the property, in view of the Chief of Engineers' statement that the cost was excessive, together with "the repeated strong efforts of certain civilian agencies to prevent the acquisition of this hotel as an Army general hospital, provided that suitable general hospital beds be made available as a substitute, that there be no delay in making final decision, and that the Breakers be retained as a general hospital until such time as other suitable facilities be made available."

The Real Estate Branch and the Construction Branch of the Office of the Chief of Engineers stated at the conference that over a 5-year period the Breakers would cost approximately \$3,572 per bed on a rental basis

without equity, and that on a purchase basis the property would cost approximately \$4,561 per bed.

It was agreed at the conference that action to consider acquisition of the hotel property and pending alterations would be postponed for 10 days pending a proposal to turn over a 2-story, semipermanent, brick, 2,200-bed station hospital at Camp Atterbury, Ind., as a general hospital to be used in place of the Breakers Hotel property. It was agreed that if, after a period of 10 days, the hospital at Camp Atterbury or some other similar hospital acceptable to the Surgeon General could not be declared available within a reasonable period, then immediate steps would be taken to acquire the additional land and to make the minimum alterations to convert the Breakers into a suitable general hospital according to plans which had been approved by the Surgeon General and the Chief of Engineers.

The committee has not been furnished with any memoranda upon which the above decisions were made and, therefore, must assume that none exists.

A memorandum dated December 8 to the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, from the Deputy Director for Plans and Operations of the Army Service Forces, stated that a reasonable rental would be \$400,000 a year, that to date \$275,000 had been expended for alterations, that an additional \$475,000 would have to be spent for alterations and the purchase of additional land, and that cost of restoration to the hotel after additional alterations would be approximately \$1,000,000.

This memorandum also stated that "considerable pressure is being brought upon the War Department by the Florida East Coast Railroad, owners of the hotel, to have it returned for their use. However, it is essential that the 1,200 hospital beds provided by this hotel be available for general hospital use."

The memorandum goes on to state that if station hospitals located at either Camp Edwards or Camp Atterbury can be vacated that they can be used as general hospitals in place of the Breakers. The memorandum concludes:

"As there is a very pressing need for additional general hospital beds and as negotiations are now under way to determine the annual rental of the hotel and the additional land required to complete the general hospital, it is requested that a decision be expedited."

On December 29, the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, directed that on or about March 1, 1944, the station hospital at Camp Atterbury be designated as a general hospital and that upon occupation of this hospital the Breakers Hotel be released to its owners.

On January 5, General Somervell advised the Chief of Engineers that the Secretary of War had directed that Camp Atterbury be designated as a general hospital and that the Breakers be released to its owners.

Thereafter there was considerable public discussion concerning the release of the hotel. In the meantime the Department of Justice had been asked to take over negotiations for the settlement of the legal controversy, and the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division at the request of the commanding general of the Army Service Forces made a study of the subject. The Assistant Attorney General recommended that from the legal and financial viewpoint it would be extravagant to relinquish the property because the additional expenditures which would have to be made to acquire title to the premises would be comparatively small in view of the considerable expense which would be involved whether or not the property were relinquished. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division forwarded his report to the War Department on March 14, 1944, and on March 25, 1944, the

commanding general of the Army Service Forces wrote to the Assistant Attorney General that he did not feel that acquisition in fee of the property could be justified and therefore requested that the Assistant Attorney General proceed with the settlement of the pending litigation.

In the meantime this committee had asked both the War Department and the Department of Justice for information concerning the hotel. The Attorney General refused to produce the Assistant Attorney General's report until after a subpoena for its production was issued by this committee. The War Department then convened a board of officers, who, on April 20, 1944, submitted a voluminous report in which they recommended the abandonment of the property not later than December 10, 1944. The Commanding General of the Army Service Forces informed this committee the property would be used as a hospital until September 1, 1944, after which it would be restored to its former condition as a hotel and returned to the owner by December 14.

During the first week of August the committee learned that the premises had been completely vacated by July 20 and that a stipulation was about to be filed which would in effect turn the property over to the owner and finally settle the litigation. The committee proceeded immediately to hold hearings and obtain all available information on the subject.

The War Department's principal reason for abandoning the Breakers Hotel appears to be the question of cost. Apparently the War Department's position on this subject has never been clear. It must originally have been thought that the cost would not be excessive. Otherwise it would not have determined to rent the hotel. Its statements on the subject are conflicting. From the memorandum of December 14, referred to above, it appears that the Surgeon General was advised by the Corps of Engineers that the cost of the property on a leased basis over a 5-year period would be approximately \$3,572 per bed. But in a memorandum to the Under Secretary of War, dated January 31, 1944, the Commanding General of the Army Service Forces stated that the cost per bed on a 5-year-lease basis would be \$2,100 on the basis of the Government's estimate of the proper rent. The commanding general added:

"The feeling is shared, however, by the Chief of Engineers, the Surgeon General, and this headquarters that court action would be favorable to a much higher rental than that estimated by the Government. The cost per bed might amount to as much as \$3,100."

In a report on the expense of operating the Breakers submitted to the board of officers investigating the abandonment of the hotel, Maj. Gen. A. H. Carter of the Army Service Forces stated that the cost per bed on initial construction of the Breakers would be \$3,730, if the purchase price were \$4,000,000, and \$3,094, if the purchase price were \$3,200,000. Again it appears that the Surgeon General was misinformed, according to the memorandum of December 14, 1943, when he was told that on a purchase basis the property would cost approximately \$4,564 per bed.

Moreover cost per bed based on a \$3,200,000 purchase price would appear to be the more reasonable. This is the figure given by the Department of Justice, which has much more experience in the field, and it appears to have been fairly accurate in its estimates concerning the proper rental value. The War Department's estimate of \$4,000,000 should be viewed in the light of the proven inability of the War Department to estimate the probable rental. However, even the \$3,094 cost per bed estimated by the War Department on the basis of a \$3,200,000 cost is much too high.

It would be a proper figure if the question were whether to acquire the hotel today and the hotel had not actually been taken in

1942. As of today the question is not how much it would cost to buy the hotel. The true question is how much it will cost to buy the hotel over and above any sum which must be spent whether or not the hotel is purchased. Thus if the hotel is purchased for \$3,200,000, the total cost of acquisition would be:

Cost of all property, including interest from original date of taking	\$3,490,000
Cost of converting to station hospital	299,000
Additional cost of converting to general hospital	400,000
War Department's estimate of cost of converting from general hospital to hotel	375,000
Total	4,564,000

* Another War Department estimate gives this figure as \$1,000,000, but this is entirely too high.

But if the proceedings are settled as now intended by the War Department, it will have cost the Government:

Rent for 2 years	\$800,000
Cost of converting to a station hospital	299,000
Cost of converting to a hotel	311,200
Total	1,410,200

This \$1,410,200 will have to be spent if the Government returns the hotel and, as of December 11, 1944, has no interest in the property at all.

To own the property will therefore cost the Government only \$3,153,800 more than must be spent in any event.

But from this \$3,153,800 must be subtracted the probable return from resale, at \$3,200,000, less an annual decrease in value of \$150,000. Handling this exactly as it is handled in the War Department's own computations, the return after 5 years' use would be \$2,450,000. Therefore, the total cost for 5 years' use would be \$3,153,800 less \$2,450,000, or \$703,800. Since 2 of the 5 years have elapsed (and must be paid for in any event) the cost per year for 3 more years would be \$234,600.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division, Department of Justice, believes that the petition to take the property in condemnation could be amended to take title from the original date of taking possession.

Therefore, the cost per bed would be about \$185 per year, on a basis of 1,260 beds, which is the number of beds the War Department uses in its calculations. War Department figures on maintenance and repair costs are conflicting. At one point of the board of officers report this figure is given as \$167 per bed per year. At another point it is stated as \$203 per bed per year, each on the basis of 1,038 beds. The set of figures estimating \$203 gives an estimate of \$207 per bed per year on the basis of 1,260 beds. Therefore, it appears that increasing the number of beds would not increase this cost. Taking \$167, the annual cost per day is \$167 plus \$185, which is \$352, or just under \$1 cost per day.

These figures should be compared with a daily cost per bed for hotels now being rented for use as redistribution centers of from \$1.28 to \$1.72 and even higher.

They also compare favorably with the costs of other rented hotels over 3-year periods. Of five listed in the board of officers' report, two show higher costs per bed per year, and three are lower. The average cost per bed per year of Navy hospitals in the southeastern United States is \$334 per year, only \$18 less.

The cost of acquisition, without considering resale would be \$3,153,800 less the cost of reconverting to a hotel on resale of \$375,000, or \$2,778,800. This amounts to \$2,205 per bed. This compares favorably with cost

of \$2,397 per bed for other hospitals constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the South Atlantic Division. The cost per bed of a great many general hospitals is higher than that of the Breakers.

The memorandum of December 14 of the Medical Corps, following its conference with the Army Service Forces and the Engineer Corps, indicates that the sole reason for agreeing to abandon the Breakers was the representations made to the Medical Corps that the cost of the Breakers was excessive.

The Surgeon General considered the Breakers an excellent hotel. In a letter dated November 18, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styre, of the Army Service Forces, stated:

"The Surgeon General considers the Breakers one of his best general hospitals and has planned to occupy this facility for the duration of the war and for such a period thereafter as may be necessary to take care of the sick and wounded."

In a memorandum dated July 19, 1943, Brig. Gen. N. W. Grant, air surgeon, stated:

"(a) That the hospital be designated to care for cases requiring specialized treatment in plastic surgery, maxillofacial surgery, ophthalmological surgery, and neurosurgery. (It is believed that a large percentage of cases requiring plastic surgery are Air Force personnel.)"

"4. The rehabilitation center in Miami, Fla., will work in close collaboration with this hospital. Their nearness to each other will materially cut down on rail traffic involved in the transfer of patients."

"5. I visualize this hospital as a model institution, bringing together the thoughts of both offices on medical care, and ironing out many apparent differences that have existed for many years."

In a memorandum dated July 30, 1943, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, stated to the commanding general of the Army Service Forces:

"1. It is recommended that the station hospital (1,038 beds) now operated by the United States Army Air Forces in the Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach, Fla., be taken over and operated as an Army general hospital to serve the Florida area and to receive patients through the overseas flyway."

"Minimal structural changes have been made, and having been made, this hotel has become a hospital most compact and simple to administer. It would be hard to find a building not originally built as a hospital that so admirably lends itself to hospital purposes. In fact, its physical construction is such that it is better for hospital use than many hospitals and far superior in design and simplicity to our planned cantonment and general hospitals. Equipment and supplies complete as is and in addition a complete 1,000-bed unit in storage which has been very little used."

The unanimous opinion of many doctors, residents of Palm Beach, relatives of servicemen and patients at the hospital, and of others who have seen the hotel is that it is an excellent facility, particularly for the treatment of plastic surgery cases and for neurosurgery. Its surroundings are ideal from the point of view of morale.

The Camp Atterbury, Ind., station hospital was named as a general hospital in place of the Breakers. The committee report on Camp Atterbury, Ind., to which an investigator was sent, indicates that Camp Atterbury is located in Indiana in a climate which, of course, is not similar to the climate of Palm Beach, Fla. Camp Atterbury, Ind., was never regarded as being in a resort or vacation area. The hospital buildings are two-story, semipermanent, cantonment-type barracks. The facilities for visitors to Camp Atterbury are extremely limited, certainly much more limited than those at Palm Beach or West Palm Beach, Fla., which were reported by a member of the staff of the Corps of Army

Engineers to be entirely satisfactory although expensive in the winter. Winter expense, of course, would be subject to control by the Office of Price Administration.

The committee's investigator was able to interview two patients who had been at Ream General and were then at Camp Atterbury. These patients' homes were in Birmingham, Ala., and in Tampa, Fla. This appears strange in view of statements made to the committee that one of the purposes of abandoning the Breakers was to place patients nearer their homes. These patients stated that Ream General Hospital was an ideal place and they preferred it to Camp Atterbury. The patients referred in particular to treatments in the open air given and appreciated at the Ream General Hospital. Whether or not they have therapeutic value they do have morale value.

Even if the Breakers were not used as a hospital, it would be as inexpensive to operate as a redistribution center as the many hotels now being acquired for that purpose. It creates maladjustments in the economy to take one hotel at the same time another is returned to civilian use, unless there are very good reasons for rejecting the one already in the Government's possession. Too many properties have been taken by the War Department and given up after very short use. Some of them should have been known in advance to be unsuitable. One large hotel in the Miami Beach area was returned within a few months after it had been taken, when it was found to be a fire hazard. This should have been known before the hotel was taken.

While the committee does not desire at any time to review decisions which relate particularly to the questions of the most desirable location for operations, such as hospitals and redistribution centers, the committee is of the opinion that in the absence of compelling reasons against the use of the Breakers, this hotel should not be returned to civilian use at this time. It is extraordinary that at the same time that the War Department particularly bemoans what it alleges to be a slackening of morale on the home front, it is willing to return to luxury use one of the most ideally located hospitals available to injured soldiers. Even though only a few of the many soldiers could enjoy these premises, it boosts the morale of every soldier to know that such premises are available to him and his comrades. While no soldier would have thought much of the matter one way or another if the Breakers had never been taken, many will find it hard to understand why it should be returned. In this connection a very vital aspect of the proposed agreement to return the hotel is that the War Department is to rehabilitate the premises itself. The owners explained to the committee that this is necessary because the owners could not obtain the necessary materials, whereas the War Department can obtain them from its military supplies not available to civilians generally. This results in giving a priority for such things as linens, paint, other materials, and even telephones and electrical wire, to a civilian operation of the most luxurious sort, which in addition to being completely a luxury facility, operates only 4 months of the year. There are many necessary civilian requirements for these same materials which in addition to being non-luxury needs, would be utilized every day of the year.

COORDINATION OF HOSPITAL PROGRAM

Prior to March 31, 1943, there was no coordination of the hospital programs of the various agencies. In 1924 a Federal Board of Hospitalization had been created, but this had never operated effectively. As a result, when the armed services began to acquire hospitals in large numbers for the present war, it became evident that much confusion and duplication would result. Accordingly, on March 31, 1943, the President ordered all of the services to report their

hospital acquisitions and arrangements to the Federal Board of Hospitalization for the purpose of coordination. On March 31, 1943, the President wrote to the Secretary of War that he was "concerned about the lack of coordination and integration of the wartime expansion of Federal hospitals with the existing Federal hospital facilities and with some over-all plan for meeting the post-war requirements for hospitalizing the veterans of this war."

Prior to this time, the Army had acquired the Breakers Hotel without any reference to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. Even subsequent to this time the Army converted the Breakers from a station hospital to a general hospital without any reference to this Board. Even later, the Army decided to abandon the Ream Hospital and issued orders to this effect on January 7, 1944, without any reference to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. In fact, the Army did not consult either the Navy or the Veterans' Administration to see if either of these agencies could use the Breakers Hotel until after the owners were notified that the hotel would be returned on January 8, 1944.

Thereafter, when a public clamor had arisen against the return of the Breakers to civilian ownership, the War Department consulted the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration to see if they desired to use the hospital, and the War Department also, on June 21, 1944, referred the question of the abandonment of the Breakers to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. This was 2 months after the Army board of officers had determined that the hospital should be abandoned, and also 2 months after the Commanding General, Army Service Forces, had written this committee to the effect that the hospital would be returned to its civilian owners. It appears affirmatively that the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration are referring their hospital acquisition questions to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. The War Department states that it is now doing so. However, the record in the case of the Breakers Hotel indicates a failure on the part of the War Department to consult the Federal Board of Hospitalization until after it had acted.

Certainly, in the case of the Breakers, there was absolutely no coordination of action among the various Federal services either at the time when the hospital was acquired, at which time inquiries to the other forces might have resulted in the Army's realizing that the hotel eventually might prove to be a white elephant, or at the time when the decision was made to abandon the hospital.

It should be pointed out that the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration have refused to use the Breakers Hotel because they have other arrangements which cover their needs, and also because of the Army's representations to them of the high cost involved in utilizing the Breakers Hotel. Both the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration, facing the prospect of taking the Breakers Hotel at this time as an original proposition, apparently are correct in refusing to consider it. The War Department's position, however, is that of minimizing a loss. In this respect it is entirely different.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has ably stated the conclusions of the committee as set forth in the report which it filed on the subject of the Breakers Hotel. Those conclusions are based on concrete evidence collected and, on a record which, in my opinion, cannot be denied. The record, of course, is open to every Member of the Senate for his inspection, but I think that at the present time it is

appropriate for me to say a few words upon the subject.

Although it may seem to some to be a minor problem, I believe it is a part of a larger one. Many committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are spending time on the problem of the disposal of surplus property. The report to which I have referred is but an indication of how the Government can acquire a great surplus of property, the disposal of which will confront the Senate and the people of this country. While we have been talking about what has been done during the past, the same thing is being done over and over. In fact, at this very moment the War Department is acquiring the Lake Placid Hotel as well as hotels in Nashville, Tenn., and in Hot Springs, Ark. Only a few days ago we heard from the R. F. C. that they are constructing buildings and acquiring other properties for the services.

So I take it that while this particular question may be considered an important one so far as the War Department is concerned, yet to the people of the country it is but one example of how we are acquiring a great surplus of property, and creating a great problem in its proper disposal so that it will not interfere with the economic stability of the country after the war.

There are further facts, therefore, which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate and of the people of the country. It is with regret that I say that the committee has found that statements of fact made by representatives of the War Department in connection with this entire matter do not appear to be accurate. For instance, the cost per bed as stated by the Engineer Corps to the Surgeon General on the basis of which the Surgeon General agreed to relinquish and turn back to the private owners the hotel, was far in excess of later War Department estimates.

Another instance was the Engineer Corps' bed estimate of a fair rental for the property. It shows that there was not exercised the care and attention which should have been exercised in such matters, and in the acquisition of all property by the Government.

Another instance is in a statement made to the committee. In a letter dated August 16, 1944, the War Department advised our committee that unless the work of reconverting the Breakers to a hotel were begun by August 21, the alterations could not be finished on December 10, when the War Department intends to return the hotel to its owners. This statement was made—and this is not my personal opinion, but the opinion of the committee—in order to induce the committee to complete its investigation. But on April 26, 1944, the War Department advised the committee that the Breakers could be used as a hospital until September 1 of this year, and that there would still be ample time for reconversion for use by the owners during the coming winter season in Florida.

The board of officers appointed by the War Department to consider the abandonment of the Breakers Hotel concluded, on the basis of positive testimony

before them, that the reconversion could be completed within 2 months, including the reinstallation of the hotel furnishings.

The report of the board of officers on the abandonment of the Breakers Hotel contains many self-contradictory statements.

I should like to illustrate the extravagance of the original acquisition of the Breakers Hotel. On December 7, 1942, the management of the hotel was given 5 days' notice that the hotel would be taken. That was after the hotel authorities had engaged the necessary help to go to Florida and had even leased a part of the hotel for the coming season. After only 5 days' notice, the Army demanded possession of the hotel and, as a matter of fact, went to court and obtained an order requiring the hotel management to deliver possession of the hotel to the Army. Actually, the premises were not used as a hospital of any kind until March 1, 1943, when they were opened as a station hospital with a capacity of 1,038 beds. According to the Army's own statement, in March there was a daily average of 32 occupied beds, in April an average of 29, in May an average of 127, in June an average of 221, and in July an average of 200. During that period another private hospital, an eleemosynary institution, could have been acquired for the same purpose for which it was proposed to use the Breakers Hotel.

The Army Air Forces offered the Breakers Hotel to the Surgeon General for use as a general hospital on July 19, 1943, when it became apparent that reduction of Army Air Forces personnel in Florida and failure of overseas evacuations to develop made it unnecessary to retain this facility as a station hospital.

It is now agreed that, as of July 19, an obligation had undoubtedly been incurred to pay a full year's rent of \$40,000.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Am I correct in understanding that when the Breakers Hotel was first taken over no agreement was entered into as to the amount of rental to be paid?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator from Ohio has asked that question. His understanding is exactly correct. At that time an Army major went to New York, interviewed representatives of the East Coast Hotel Co., and stated that the Army was going to take the hotel and that it would pay approximately \$200,000 a year in rental.

Mr. BURTON. Am I to understand that, in now turning the hotel back to its owners, instead of settling for \$200,000 a year the Army is settling for twice that amount, namely, \$400,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. So not only was there no agreement when the Army took possession, but it is now paying twice the original estimate which it made when the Army took possession of the hotel.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly correct. It shows how the negotiations were conducted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was a renegotiation clause put into the contract? A contract of that nature should be renegotiated. There is a renegotiation law. I do not know whether the law applies to such contracts as the one involved here, but certainly there ought to be renegotiation of an arrangement of the kind to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I understand that the criticism of the Senator from Michigan is not directed at the settlement agreed upon, but at the estimate which was made by the Army in the first instance. Am I correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator say that the hotel was rented for approximately \$200,000 a year?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that figure represented the Army's estimate.

Mr. HATCH. The owners of the hotel contended for more than \$500,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they so contended at the time they were told that the property would have to be taken from them.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. At the time the Army took possession of the property no agreement was entered into as to the amount of rental to be paid. The owners of the hotel were contending for approximately \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year. The Army apparently estimated that the rental should be \$200,000 a year. The inadequacy of the Army's estimate is now apparent, because in its readiness to return the hotel to its owners after 2 years of occupancy, it is willing to pay twice the amount of the original estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is what is being said true of many hotels, or is the Senator from Michigan referring to an isolated case?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should say that many other hotels were handled in a similar way. In Seattle the new Richmond Hotel was acquired by the Army for hospital purposes. Later the Navy was asked if it could use the hotel as a hospital, because the Army had decided it did not need it. Representatives of the Navy testified before the investigating committee that they could not under any circumstances use the hotel for hospital purposes, and it was turned back to its owners at considerable cost to the Government.

Mr. President, I am speaking today about the lack of care in the acquisition of properties. The result has been a surplus not only of hospitals but also of lands. We had before the committee statements as to the enormous acreage of farm lands and the enormous acreage

of timberlands and various other kinds of lands that have been acquired. It really shocks the imagination to know the amount of land and the amount of property that have been acquired by the Federal Government by condemnation proceedings during the last few years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In taking this land they did not agree on any price, did they?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at all. They merely decided overnight, as it were, that they wanted the property in 5 days. They took possession of this large hotel without any other warning and said they would pay \$200,000 a year rental, whereas the owner considered on his own figures that it was worth in excess of \$500,000, and now the Army itself admits that it was worth \$400,000 a year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that in Minnesota—the distinguished Senator from that State can tell us about it—they went in and took farm land and they have not paid for it yet. Is not that correct?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in Minnesota they took some of the finest farm land with the best soil and having on it some of the finest farm buildings. They took a great deal of it, and put the owners out, when they could have obtained land that was not so expensively built up and that was not so valuable. Some of that land was worth \$150 an acre and some of it \$200 an acre. I am not sure whether it is a fact, but I was told that it was said by the sales agents of the Army that they were going to pay \$50 an acre for it. I may be wrong about that, but they took the land off the tax rolls in a very prosperous community. To a large extent it will wreck the community. They took the best farm lands having the best farm buildings for which they had no use, when they could have gone somewhere else and taken land on which there were no buildings on which to construct ammunition plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the comment of the Senator from Minnesota. I think I should indicate that it was the various services and agencies of the Government that were demanding the land. We cannot condemn the Land Division of the Department of Justice, for the manner in which they took it, because the Army and various other services were demanding that it be taken overnight.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to hear the statement of the Senator from Michigan concerning the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice had nothing to do with the original acquisitions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. The Department of Justice is called in when there is a failure

to agree upon a price. Then the Department must institute condemnation proceedings. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly correct. What I have said is not a criticism of the method of taking land; it is a criticism of the actual taking of the land. The acts of the Land Division of the Department of Justice are not being criticized.

We find that \$299,000 had been invested to convert the premises to a hospital. Substantially the same amount, or \$310,000, would have to be invested to convert it back to a hotel. The total is \$609,000. And after only 4½ months of partial use the Army Air Forces, which had originally taken the hotel, were through with it. As of this point, the total number of patients was 661 and the average number of beds occupied was 122, or a cost for providing the building alone, of over \$8,000 for each bed occupied.

We had in existence at this very time, Mr. President, a hospital board, which was formed back in 1924. If it had been consulted it could have advised as to the necessity or advisability of taking this hotel as a hospital; but it was not consulted and was not asked for its advice.

The War Department's principal reason for abandoning this hotel today appears to be the question of cost. The committee agrees that the original cost was too high. It is clear that the hotel never should have been acquired and that the acquisition was a blunder. But its retention after large financial obligations had been incurred is another question. Our figures show that the total cost of acquiring title to the Breakers for the Government would be \$4,564,000. Our figures also show that whether or not the hotel is bought, it will cost the Government \$1,410,000 to abandon the hotel now, and that, too, after the Government has had very little use of the hotel as a hospital. If we pay the \$4,500,000 to keep the hotel, we do not have to pay the \$1,400,000 in addition. Therefore, it will cost us a net of only \$3,100,000 to keep this hotel. Even the War Department agrees that the hotel can readily be sold after the war with a probable loss to the Government only of normal depreciation. As a result, the net cost for acquiring this hotel, even if we kept it only 3 more years and then sold it, would be only \$700,000. The cost per year for each of 3 years would be only \$234,600. The cost per bed, including all maintenance and repairs, would be \$352 a year, or less than \$1 a day.

The Members of the Senate should know that the War Department is now leasing other hotels. It is leasing them for reassignment purposes. It is acquiring hotels at such places as Lake Placid, N. Y., Asheville, N. C., Hot Springs, Ark., and on the west coast. These hotels will cost between \$1.23 to \$1.72 per bed, per day, whereas, as I have said, the figures show that the Breakers Hotel used for the same purpose would cost only a dollar a day per bed.

The cost of acquiring the Breakers Hotel and using it as a hospital would be considerably less than the cost of a

great many of the other general hospitals, which are not being abandoned, providing there was not charged against the hospital the \$1,410,000 which will have to be paid whether we take it or not. This is a fair assumption. It comes down to this: If it will cost the Government a million and a half dollars, whether or not we have the hotel and for \$3,000,000 more we can get the hotel, obviously the hotel is costing us only \$3,000,000.

The Surgeon General was consulted. He considered the Breakers an excellent hotel, for in a letter dated November 18, 1943, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styre, of the Army Service Forces, stated:

The Surgeon General considers the Breakers one of his best general hospitals and has planned to occupy this facility for the duration of the war and for such a period thereafter as may be necessary to take care of the sick and wounded.

In a memorandum dated July 19, 1943, Brig. Gen. N. W. Grant Air Surgeon, stated:

(a) That the hospital be designated to care for cases requiring specialized treatment in plastic surgery, maxillofacial surgery, ophthalmological surgery, and neurosurgery. (It is believed that a large percentage of cases requiring plastic surgery are air force personnel.)

He goes on to say:

I visualize this hospital as a model institution, bringing together the thoughts of both offices on medical care, and ironing out many apparent differences that have existed for many years.

Yet, in the face of such testimony, we find the Army turning this hotel back and suffering a loss of \$1,410,000. In a memorandum dated July 30, 1943, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, stated to the commanding general of the Army Service Forces:

1. It is recommended that the station hospital (1,038 beds) now operated by the United States Army Air Forces in the Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach, Fla., be taken over and operated as an Army general hospital to serve the Florida area and to receive patients through the overseas flyway.

Minimal structural changes have been made, and having been made, this hotel has become a hospital most compact and simple to administer. It would be hard to find a building not originally built as a hospital that so admirably lends itself to hospital purposes. In fact, its physical construction is such that it is better for hospital use than many hospitals and far superior in design and simplicity to our planned cantonment and general hospitals. Equipment and supplies complete as is and in addition a complete 1,000-bed unit in storage which has been very little used.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but does he propose to discuss what it will cost to disband those who now staff this hospital, to disperse the doctors to various other places?

Mr. FERGUSON. I had not proposed to do that, but I will say to the Senator that it represents a considerable amount.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator might very well comment on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that we have set up a staff of nurses, of internes, and of doctors. We have the hospital, and, as the Surgeon General said, it is completely equipped. We are going to find the patients taken out of this hospital and many of them sent to Atterbury Hospital in Indiana. The doctors will have to find other hospitals in which to work. That is another cause of great expense which we have found in searching the records and in the testimony which was given before us.

It is the unanimous opinion of many doctors residing at Palm Beach, of relatives of servicemen, and of patients at the hospital, and of others who have seen the Breakers Hotel, that it is an excellent facility, particularly for the treatment of plastic surgery cases and for neurosurgery. Its surroundings are ideal from the point of view of morale. There it sits upon the ocean front, giving an ocean view and ocean use to those who are coming back to health, who have been in the armed services.

While the committee did not desire at any time to review decisions which relate particularly to the questions of the most desirable location for operations, such as hospitals and redistribution centers, the committee was of the opinion that in the absence of compelling reasons against the use of the Breakers, this hotel should not be returned to civilian use at this time. It is extraordinary that at the same time that the War Department particularly bemoans what it alleges to be a slackening of morale on the home front, it is willing to return to luxury use one of the most ideally located hospitals available to injured soldiers. Even though only a few of the many soldiers could enjoy these premises, it boosts the morale of every soldier to know that such premises are available to him and his comrades in case they might need it. While no soldier would have thought much of the matter one way or the other if the Breakers had never been taken, many will find it hard to understand why it should be returned and the owners should be paid \$1,410,000 for the meager use that it has been put to in the past 2 years.

In this connection, a very vital aspect of the proposed agreement to return the hotel is that the War Department is to rehabilitate the premises itself. The owners explained to the committee that this is necessary because the owners cannot obtain the necessary materials, whereas the War Department can obtain them from its military supplies not available to civilians generally. This results in giving a priority for such things as linens, paints, and other materials; yes, even telephones and electric wire, to a civilian operation of the most luxurious sort.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the committee have any evidence as to what the Government could sell this hotel for if the Government placed it on the market? What is the fair cash market value now? If it cost \$4,500,000, and we are to pay out more money to rehabilitate it, before we

do so would it not be better to ascertain from some proper source what the hotel could be sold for? We have to look at the question from the Government's standpoint.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may answer that question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I will answer that question, because I have exactly the same idea the Senator from Tennessee has, and, being a little practical minded myself, I thought it was an important consideration. Our committee was informed that this is one of the most salable properties in the United States. Am I not correct in that statement, I ask the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. That statement is exactly correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Government could sell the property at this time and come out whole, manifestly that is what we ought to do with it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HATCH. My own thought is this, that we could take this property and utilize it for hospital purposes. I do not know how long we should use it for such purposes. But when the time came that it was no longer needed for such purposes, I think we could sell the property for pretty close to what it cost, if perhaps not at a profit.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have that comment, because the figures given before the committee indicated as much. As I stated before, if we take it and use it for a period of 3 years, it would cost about a dollar a day per bed on a resale basis, so we could resell it at that time, after we had used it, instead of acquiring other places which we are acquiring, which are going to cost more per bed.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the hotel cost \$4,500,000, and it is being rented to the Government at \$400,000 a year, that is a very, very large income on the amount invested, and I think the contract should be renegotiated.

Mr. FERGUSON. The payment of \$400,000 rental on a \$4,000,000 property is a high rental.

Mr. President, we find that in addition to the hotel being completely a luxury facility operated only 4 months a year, there are many civilian requirements for the same materials to be used in reconversion, which in addition to being nonluxury needs, can be utilized every day of the year.

In other words, if we keep this property as a hospital, and have the doctors who are there remain, the equipment which is now there would be used, and we would not be required to reconvert it to a luxury hotel, at a time when many of the articles which would be put in there could be put to other civilian use where they would be used 365 days a year, whereas in this hotel they will be used but 4 months in a year.

Mr. President, there is another question I should like to refer to at this time, dealing with the same subject. I wish to comment upon the reluctance of the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, to furnish the committee with

material and factual information to which it was entitled as a matter of law, and which should have been readily and willingly furnished upon request. The report of March 14, 1944, by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division to General Somervell in regard to the probable liabilities of the Government in settling the condemnation case for acquisition of a leasehold or temporary interest in the Breakers Hotel, contrasted with the possible liabilities of the Government should the hotel be acquired outright, was a factual analysis devoid of any questions involving military secrecy; it involved simply a matter of transacting Government business in a matter which had already been the subject of investigation by our committee. In pressing the committee's investigation further, it was very natural, indeed quite necessary, that the committee should request from the Attorney General a copy of this report.

A request was made to the Attorney General for the report, but the report was not forthcoming. The Attorney General's failure to submit the report retarded the investigation by the committee. Only by subpoena did the committee secure it.

The incident is of great significance as a matter of principle. Not only ordinary courtesy, cooperative relations between the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and the interests of the public welfare, but also the law of the Constitution, demands that fullest cooperation from the Attorney General, as well as other executive officers. The investigational powers of Congress are too well known to require comment. They are as old as the Constitutional Convention and were taken for granted without question there. Indeed, one of the reasons assigned for requiring annual meetings of the Congress was stated by George Mason, Delegate from Virginia, who said that—

The legislature, besides legislative, is to have inquisitorial powers, which cannot safely be long kept in a state of suspension.

In other words, Mr. President, if committees of the Senate are to investigate problems and pass legislation dealing with them, and investigate contracts made with the Federal Government, it is essential that they have the fullest cooperation not only of the Attorney General, but of every other governmental department.

The Attorney General of the United States seems unaware of this vital function of Congress, for on two occasions it has been necessary for this committee to issue a subpoena to secure information from the Attorney General which there was no possible grounds for his refusing to furnish. It seems unfortunate that it should be necessary to advise the chief legal officer of the United States Government in respect to his duties.

The attitude of the Attorney General in this case has been prejudicial to the public interest. It seems that in addition to his opposition to aiding this committee, he declined to make available to the War Department the advice of Assistant Attorney General Littell, who had made an exhaustive study of the Break-

ers Hotel case. General Somervell, having appointed a committee within the War Department to consider the question of policy as to whether the hotel should be acquired outright or relinquished to the owners at the expiration of the lease term, wrote to the Attorney General suggesting that the Department send a representative to meet with that committee, expressly mentioning Assistant Attorney General Littell, but the Attorney General declined to have Mr. Littell participate in those deliberations.

It might well be that his discussion of the case, which this committee has found most helpful in understanding it, would have changed the conclusion reached by General Somervell's committee, as there was otherwise no member of the committee of wholly independent judgment who was not on General Somervell's staff or subject to his authority. In dealing with any public issue of this character, all information in any department and the best expert opinions which are available ought to be brought to bear in the public interest. It is regrettable that the Attorney General did not follow this course in the instant case.

Mr. President, once before I had occasion to mention this identical subject, when we had under consideration the Canol project. In that case we found that the Petroleum Administrator for War was not consulted. If the time has come in America when our agencies are to consult only the "yes" men, and not those who may have knowledge of the facts, and who might be critical of proposals, then I say that this Nation will have surplus goods which it will never be able to dispose of. We shall never be able to enact legislation to dispose of surplus property acquired in the manner in which this property has been acquired. I say that the time has come when "yes" men should not be consulted, but critics of various proposals should be consulted, and we should have civilian judgment as well as military judgment in connection with these problems. We should have a judgment which will satisfy the people of the United States, and which they can support.

SHORTAGE OF FARM MACHINERY IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate the desperate plight of the farmers in the Northwest with relation to farm machinery. When this war started, I decided that I would not be a Republican or a Democrat, but an American, fighting for this Republic until the war was over, and that I would put out of my mind all sense of partisanship. But, Mr. President, the Gallup poll tells the story only too well. Farmers all over the country are resenting the rotten, indefensible deal they are receiving at the hands of the present Democratic administration. All over the Northwest farmers are daily losing money because of the incompetency of various bureaucrats holding responsible positions under this administration in Washington.

Last May I called the attention of the Senate and of the heads of various bureaus to what was happening to the farmers because of their inability to obtain farm machinery. I hold in my

hand a letter written on the 12th of June by the administrative assistant of the State committee of the Agricultural Conservation Office at Fargo, N. Dak. It reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Reference is made to your letter of June 5, regarding the application filed by Mr. George A. Schick, of Lark, N. Dak., for a new combine.

I may add for the benefit of Senators who do not know what a combine is that it is a machine used to harvest grain.

This applicant wrote to us on May 15 requesting that the rationing committee act on his combine application. A copy of our reply to that letter is enclosed. Mr. Schick again wrote us on June 1 and his letter of that date is worded practically the same as the letter addressed to you, which we are herewith returning. A copy of our reply to Mr. Schick's letter of June 1 is also enclosed.

We regret that it is necessary for our county committees to disapprove so many applications for new combines, but unless more combines are produced and allotted to North Dakota there is no alternative. As you probably know, our State quota for combines was recently reduced by 763 machines (560 John Deere and 203 McCormick-Deering) because the manufacturers were unable to produce them due to manpower shortages in these plants. We did receive a partial replacement of some of this cut (126 J. I. Case combines) but our allotment is 637 less than the number we had expected to receive. Our present State quota is 2,130 combines of all makes and sizes and a total of approximately 5,500 applications for new combines had been filed in county offices as of May 31, 1944.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND E. MOREHEAD,

Administrative Assistant, State Committee.

Mr. President, this does not begin to tell the story, because county committee after county committee, when farmers applied for combines, were simply told that the quota was exhausted, and that there was no use in filing applications, with the result that thousands of farmers are not included in the list of 5,500.

Mr. President, where are these combines going, which our own farmers in this country cannot get? On the 1st of July, through one little town in North Dakota, the town of Portal—I doubt whether Senators ever heard of it—3 combines were sent to Canada. On July 2, 12 combines were sent to Canada through the town of Portal; on July 3, 20 combines were sent to Canada through the little town of Portal; on July 4, 16 combines; on July 5, 5 combines; on July 6, 5 more; on July 7, 14 combines; on July 8, 8 combines; on July 9, 16 combines; on July 10, 3; on July 11, 3; on July 12, 2; on July 13, 3; on July 14, 3; on July 15, 13; on July 16, 1; on July 17, 11; on July 18, 2; on July 19, 2; on July 22, 4; on July 23, 12; on July 24, 6; on July 26, 14; on July 27, 3; on July 28, 11; on July 30, 13; on July 31, 25. Two hundred and thirty combines were sent to Canada at the very time when our farmers were begging for them. They were sent through the State of North Dakota, past the homes of farmers who were pleading for them.

On the 1st of August 10 combines more went through Portal; on August 2, 12; on August 3, 14; on August 4, 12; on August 7, 33; on August 8, 6; on August 9,

6; on August 13, 2; on August 14, 6; on August 15, 2; on August 16, 3; and up to the 16th, 106 more combines, which are so essential to the welfare of the farmers of North Dakota, were sent through one little town to Canada.

This morning I received a telegram from Portal, reading as follows:

One carload of six combines exported at Portal today.

Mr. President, I have before me many letters, out of thousands which I have in my office. Last Friday I placed 30 or 40 of them in the RECORD. These letters are along the same lines as the ones which I placed in the RECORD the other day. Here is one sent to me by an outstanding citizen of the State of North Dakota, Mr. A. Robbie, a man who has been mayor of his town, the town of Cavalier, in Pembina County.

His letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I hope you will pardon me—

Mr. President, these farmers have been so beaten down by bureaucrats when they were begging for tires, for plows, and for little gears they needed to place in the back of their tractors that now they even apologize to their own Senator for daring to write to him.

This man has been mayor of the town. He writes as follows:

I hope you will pardon me for sending you the wire this morning in regard to the trouble we are having in getting repairs for our machinery. I have just been kept busy chasing over the country trying to locate repairs which the local agents have been unable to supply. One of our combines, a No. 11 International, broke down yesterday and has been idle now for 24 hours just because I could not get concaves. It happened that we picked up metal yesterday and three of them were broken. I finally located one at Hallock, Minn., and just returned from there with it now. It is exasperating to have the machines idle when we have as much grain lying swathed and weather conditions so bad as they have been for the last 3 weeks now. Some of our grain was cut the last week in July and is still on the ground. Anything you can do to help out the present situation will surely be appreciated.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

A. ROBBIE.

On Friday I read a letter, to which I wish to refer now, from Mr. L. Krucken-berg, who lives at the other end of the State. In his letter he says:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I want to inform you that I finally got an order for a new grain binder. Am sorry to report that by the time I will get the machine I may be through with harvesting.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Myhra Equipment Co., in Cass County, showing the number of applications filed by honest-to-God farmers trying to get hold of machinery with which to gather their crops. The letter refers to combines alone. The letter was addressed to Mr. Irvin Piper, who sent it to me. His address is Wheatland, N. Dak.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. PIPER: As per our conversation the other day, we are enclosing a list of farmers' orders we have on hand for Case combines for Cass County farmers.

The orders are only for Case combines, mind you, Mr. President, for Cass County farmers—farmers in just one county, and orders for just one kind of combine.

I read further from the letter:

Our allotment for Case combines for Cass County consists of 10—two 6-foot and eight above 6-foot. We have at the present time received from the Case Co., two 6-foot machines and four 12-foot machines for Cass County on which certificates had been issued for quite some time. By comparing the orders we have on hand with the machines we are allotted it will give you some idea of the seriousness of this situation. In addition to the Case allotment for Cass County we are allotted 3 Gleaner Baldwin 12-foot machines for Cass County. This would make a total of 13. We were allotted 5 more combines from the Case Co. which they do not expect to have manufactured and delivered in time for harvest. The writer hopes that you can make some use of this information.

Mr. President, attached to the letter is a list of those farmers. They live in the vicinity of Fargo, N. Dak.

The list reads as follows:

RETAIL ORDERS FOR CASE COMBINES FOR CASS COUNTY

Selmer Otis, Kindred, 9 feet; Alfred Johnson, Hunter; O. E. Rose, Ayr, 12 feet; John L. Ford, Casselton; Harry Combs, Chaffee; Henry Krabbenhoff, Fargo; I. B. Scoville, Grandin, 12 feet; C. R. Landbloom, Fargo; M. A. Severson, Kindred; H. L. Ecklund, Harwood; A. M. Hedlund, Fargo; Ted. M. Lee, Kindred; Melvin Strand, Hickson; Olof A. Perhus, Kindred; Leo E. Grieger, Erie; Herman Rust, Fargo; B. J. Rogne, Kindred; W. A. Francis, West Fargo; George A. Kounovsky, Fargo; Walter Jahnke, Amenia; Nipstad Brothers, Kindred; Tollef Tronsgaard, Argusville; August Murray, Wheatland; Dale Hull, Page; Earl Franke, Erie; Fred Peach, Erie; Frank Matzke, Buffalo; S. Husso, Erie; Willbert Still, Page; Olander Johnson, Kindred; Iver Bakken, Galsburg; John Brainerd, Portland; Donald Larson, Hunter; William A. Schwandt, Buffalo; E. A. Marcks, Buffalo; T. O. Grant, Fargo; Rudolph Opp, Gardner; Alvin Anderson, Harwood; Richard Weisbach, Durbin; Ed. Boutz, Casselton; Theo. L. Gulvig, Davenport; John Hardin, Fargo; C. O. Peterson, Harwood; Eddie Saewert, Davenport; A. E. Miller, Buffalo; Reuben Kemmer, Casselton; Wallace Spooner, Durbin; Russell Quisberg, Embden; Arnold Hoffman, Wheatland; Allen Gross, Casselton; Richard Viestenz, Arthur; H. E. Combs, Chaffee; W. E. Bucholz, Durbin; Emil Sommerfield, Alice; Emil Hendrickson, Davenport; Virgil Miller, Buffalo; Nathan Idso, Ayr; George Hajek, Davenport; George Schonberg, Casselton; Art Miller, Durbin; Roy D. Cameron, Erie; John Conrad, Erie; Orin Hogen, Buffalo; Clarence Hayek, Fargo; L. Holm, Page; E. A. Goltz, Leonard; W. A. Rueckert, Ayr; J. C. Wadson, Alice; R. E. Cameron, Ayr; Lloyd Miller, Buffalo; Kenneth Erickson, Kindred; Ewald Moderow, Casselton; J. M. Elliott, Grandin; Ed. Wegner, Arthur; A. H. Butke, Buffalo; Otto Schneekloth, Buffalo; Fred Heindinrich, Kindred; Reynold Dittmer, Durbin; Brandsted Brothers, Amenia; Albert Akason, Mapleton; Frank Jendro, Wheatland; Adolph Lebus, Davenport; Lewis Velsting, Arthur; C. T. Perkhous, Arthur; Axel Akeison, Grandin; A. Slingsay, Argusville; J. M. Elliott, Grandin; Joseph Lerfald, Galsburg; Andrew Jespersen, Buffalo; Art Glasow, Davenport; Loraine Langer, Fingal; Myron Stenseth, Buffalo; Edward Kummer, Walcott; Emil Piper, Davenport; William Geerdes, Davenport; Kensok Brothers, Chaffee; E. W. Marshall, Wheatland; W. E. Bayley, Page; William Zimmerman, Arthur; John Bryan, Leonard; Myron Stenseth, Buffalo; R. T. Card, Alice; Ralph Schneekloth, Tower City; Orville Satrom,

Page; Henry Kuball, Grandin; Alfred Johnson, Hunter; Arnold & Hugo Hoffman, Wheatland; F. O. Kellerman, Davenport; Fred Kingston, Casselton; all in the State of North Dakota.

I have read the addresses in order to show the towns in which the farmers live. All of them are within a radius of approximately 25 miles on one side of Fargo, in just one direction. There are a total of 108 applications. Mr. President, I call the attention of this body to the fact that right by the homes of these 108 farmers who are trying to eke out a living, trying to raise grain so that there may be food with which to carry on this war—men who believe that food is just as important as gunpowder and other munitions—the railroads have been transporting combines to Canada.

I have before me some additional letters and telegrams. For example, I hold in my hand a letter from Napoleon, N. Dak., in the southern part of the State. It is typical of the kind of letters which are being sent. The letter is undated, except for the month—August—but I received it only today, so I know it is a recent one. It reads as follows:

MR. LANGER: Today I filled out an application to obtain a certificate to purchase a new truck.

Some Senators may not know what a combine is, but I assume that all Senators know what a truck is. I will show the Senate the experience our farmers are having in their attempts to obtain the trucks they need.

I read further from the letter:

As they have to be appraised in Washington, I thought there might be something you could do to help along for its approval. I know it is asking a great deal of you, but I have always had a great deal of confidence in your work, and trust you will be of great help—

He is applying to a United States Senator, in these times, Mr. President, for assistance in obtaining a little, measly truck so that he can produce food. Is it any wonder that the Gallup poll shows that all over the country the present administration is losing the regard of the farmers—as it should, with this kind of an administration that is treating the farmers in this totally unworthy and abominable manner.

The writer of the letter further says:

You see, I have 800 acres from which the grain has to be hauled, and have a fairly large herd of cattle and hogs, and have no truck at all. I have to depend on the other fellow, and wait until he gets around. Generally it's late, and then he charges so much that he gets more for hauling than I do for raising it. It's unbearable.

Last year my grain was dumped on a pile in the field. The trucker didn't get to haul it until we had a few snowstorms, so you can just about know how much was left for profit.

Mr. President, I might say that I submitted Resolution 185 at a time when we showed there were millions of bushels of grain scattered all over the western section of North Dakota and the eastern section of Montana.

I read further from the letter:

Mother and I are farming together and have 800 acres of crop to haul, and have 60 head of cattle, also other livestock. So

when the year's trucking is totaled, it nearly pays for a truck.

So you can see we have use for a truck the year round. It's just as necessary as a tractor on a farm.

I have on my desk scores and scores of letters and telegrams, some of which I placed in the Record on Friday. They show that the situation relative to tractors is the same as that relative to combines.

The fact is that a number of tractors are being sent to Canada at the very time when thousands of our farmers cannot obtain the tractors they need. That is shown by letters which I shall read, and by the records in the office in Washington.

On July 1, through one little town, namely, Portal, 6 tractors were sent to Canada. On July 2, 20 tractors; on July 3, 35 tractors; on July 4, 22 tractors; on July 5, 17 tractors; on July 6, 5 tractors; on July 9, 9 tractors; on July 10, 32 tractors; on July 11, 6 tractors; on July 13, 12 tractors; on July 14, 28 tractors; on July 15, 17 tractors; on July 16, 8 tractors, and on July 17, 40 tractors were sent through at one time. My information is that they all were equipped with nice rubber tires, just as were the combines which had been shipped from the United States. At least the ones which I myself saw by going to Portal were equipped with rubber tires.

On July 18, 9 tractors were sent through Portal; on July 19, 19 tractors; on July 22, 34 tractors; on July 23, 31 tractors; on July 24, 38 tractors; on July 25, 21 tractors; on July 26, 5 tractors; on July 27, 26 tractors; on July 28, 17 tractors; on July 29, 10 tractors; on July 30, 22 tractors; and on July 31, 25 tractors, or a total of 514 tractors sent through one little town of North Dakota and exported to Canada. It is an indication of the thousands and thousands of tractors which must have been sent to Canada through all the small points of export.

On August 1, 1944, 15 tractors were shipped through Portal, N. Dak., to Canada; on August 2, 3 tractors; on August 4, 3 tractors; on August 7, 4 tractors; on August 11, 4 tractors; on August 12, 4 tractors; on August 13, 10 tractors; on August 14, 16 tractors; on August 17, 5 tractors; and on August 18, 5 tractors, or a total of 69 tractors.

During a period of 6 weeks, when farmers throughout the country were down on their knees begging the Administration for help in obtaining tractors and combines so they could save their crops which were shelling and rotting in the fields, and at the very time the letter which I have read stated that North Dakota could not obtain a quota, there were exported to Canada 583 tractors and 336 combines.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter which is typical of others I have received. It is from Ashley, N. Dak., a town located in the southern section of the State. It was written on the 18th of August 1944. I have just received it.

DEAR SENATOR: I have tried about everything else ever since last January to get a permit for a new tractor without any success or even get the local board or the State office much interested in my case. I have

farmed for several years for myself and have this year 322 acres in crop. * * *

I have always tried to farm with horses, with the intention that if I buy a tractor it should be a new one. They want as high as \$1,400 for old tractors, where new ones can be bought for a little over \$1,100.

That is, if they are available.

I feel that our local board is not treating me fair by always denying me a permit for a new tractor, as I had several chances to buy the new tractor if I had had the permit.

As I showed a few minutes ago, the local boards deny the permits, because, they say, the quotas are not only exhausted but there are already on file thousands upon thousands of applications for tractors which cannot be filled.

I shall not mention the name of the writer of the letter or the name of the persons to whom he refers, because I do not want to get anyone into trouble. The letter continues:

Now Mr. ———, who was my close neighbor, but who is now living in Ellendale and comes from there to help on his farm, has a good tractor and he got a permit since I applied for a new tractor, and he bought a new tractor and now wants to sell me his old one for \$1,000. And there is Mr. ———, who is a trucker and farms from the town of Ashley. He bought a new tractor in 1943 and a new one in 1944, and there are more such cases that had good tractors and sold their old one and bought a new one, but I am always denied. It looks to me there must be either politics in this business or else they pay something to get these favors.

I feel that I will not extra cater or pay anything to get a permit for a new tractor, but I must have a tractor to carry on my farming. I wanted a tractor to harvest my crop, but as I could not get one had to do it with the horses, and then Mr. ——— getting a new tractor and then offering to sell me his old one for \$1,000, that makes me feel that I am just downed. * * *

I was in Aberdeen just recently where they had a new tractor that I could have bought, if I had a permit, for a little over \$1,100, and they had an old one for which they wanted \$1,400.

Mr. President, once more I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the terrible plight of the farmers who cannot obtain machinery. As I said a few days ago, when I was home recently we held a hearing with regard to the situation of farmers who were not able to obtain machinery. One county agent testified that last year a million bushels of wheat and thousands upon thousands of bushels of flax had been destroyed because they could not be harvested. Testimony showed that one farmer had to drive more than 800 miles in order to buy a little 75-cent gear for his tractor. Another man had to drive through several towns before he could obtain a similar gear.

So, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate once more to the desperate situation in which the farmers of North Dakota find themselves today. I wish Members of the Senate to know that in North Dakota thousands of acres are not being properly harvested because of the lack of necessary machinery with which to harvest them. I wish the Senate also to know that at the very time when the farmers of the United States cannot obtain necessary machinery the National Trucking Association, last Friday, sent me—and I presume

every other Member of the Senate—a magazine showing that they have sent trucks all over the world, including Ethiopia. In behalf of the farmers of this country, I wish to protest most vigorously, Mr. President, against the kind of treatment which the farmers are receiving at the hands of this administration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law. By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment for temporary service in the Navy; and Col. Franklin A. Hart, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 25, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Service nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 22 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Theodore P. Wright, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, vice Charles I. Stanton, resigned.

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Marshall L. Shepard, of Pennsylvania, to be recorder of deeds, District of Columbia, vice William J. Thompkins, deceased.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Sidney Frederick, August 15, 1944.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1944

Raymond F. Kaiser

John P. Turner

IN THE NAVY

Ensign Clarence F. Avery, A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to be an ensign in the Navy, to rank from the 6th day of January 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Joseph O. M. Thatcher, October 7, 1941.

Edmond P. Larkin, November 22, 1941.

Bothwell Graham III, May 26, 1942.

Francis E. Martin, July 6, 1942.

Rider R. Lewis, July 14, 1942.

Byron D. Casteel, July 15, 1942.

Charles B. Tolle, July 1, 1943.

Richard B. Leander, July 8, 1943.

Mark F. Todd, July 10, 1943.

Robert P. Lyons, July 10, 1943.

John F. Kincald, Jr., July 10, 1943.

Charles W. Harding, July 10, 1943.

John A. Pease, July 10, 1943.

Robert T. Maurer, July 11, 1943.

Edward J. Hagan, July 12, 1943.

Donald B. Freshwater, July 24, 1943.

John R. Cole, January 9, 1944.

V. Dale Alquist, January 13, 1944.

Arthur B. Watts, January 10, 1944.

Joseph F. Rorke, January 20, 1944.

Jackson H. Stuckey, March 6, 1944.

Kenneth G. Jones, April 4, 1944.

Claude E. Arnett, Jr., May 3, 1944.

William B. Ford, May 30, 1944.

William A. Cantrell, June 1, 1944.

James A. Stewart, June 1, 1944.

Frederick G. Dorsey, June 1, 1944.

Dorliska W. Brown, Jr., June 5, 1944.

Charles C. Sprague, June 6, 1944.

Joe B. Stephens, June 6, 1944.

Marvin F. Sherrill, June 7, 1944.

Walter D. Roberts, June 7, 1944.

Malcolm Y. Colby, Jr., June 7, 1944.

Henry G. Gardiner, Jr., June 7, 1944.

Jackson W. Modisett, June 7, 1944.

John R. Weber, June 7, 1944.

Arvin T. Henderson, June 7, 1944.

Jack J. Hatfield, June 7, 1944.

Victor V. Davie, June 7, 1944.

Rolla D. Burghard, June 8, 1944.

Richard L. Mason, June 8, 1944.

William C. Mills, Jr., June 8, 1944.

Walter P. Anthony, Jr., June 8, 1944.

William R. Thornton, June 9, 1944.

James Y. Bradfield, June 10, 1944.

Andrew J. Causey, June 10, 1944.

William H. Thompson, June 27, 1944.

Donald E. Stephens, June 27, 1944.

Irving L. White, June 27, 1944.

Robert H. Mitchell, June 28, 1944.

Marshall M. Searcy, June 30, 1944.

Hugh H. Hanson, July 8, 1944.

Charles F. Climie, Jr., July 26, 1944.

John T. Manning, July 26, 1944.

John D. Conway, July 28, 1944.

John W. Markson, July 28, 1944.

George H. Lawrence, July 28, 1944.

Eugene W. Rumsey, August 5, 1944.

Amos B. Root, Jr., August 5, 1944.

Frank R. Morrow, August 5, 1944.

Donald B. Hull, August 5, 1944.

Adrian B. Goodman, August 5, 1944.

Walter R. Ogden, August 5, 1944.

Franklin J. Grabill, August 9, 1944.

Ensign William K. Woodward, D-V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 18th day of February 1943.

Assistant Paymaster James J. Lynch to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 9th day of June 1941, to adjust the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Assistant Paymaster Rex W. Warner to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

Ensign William T. Peach 3d, United States Navy, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of June 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended:

Donald G. H. Jaekels, from the 16th day of March 1941.

Kenneth R. Chamberlain, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Robert J. Bear, from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert F. Stout, from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert W. Vaupell, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Harold G. Schlendering, from the 30th day of August 1941.

James B. Maguire, Jr., from the 8th day of October 1941.

Clair "C" Chamberlain, from the 10th day of October 1941.

John P. Sigman, from the 14th day of October 1941.

George F. Bastian, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Israel E. Boniske, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Brenten G. Myking, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Robert O. White, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Jack E. Conger, from the 16th day of December 1941.

James A. Gilchrist, from the 16th day of December 1941.

Oliver T. Koch, from the 16th day of December 1941.

Elton Mueller, from the 16th day of December 1941.

Lynn H. Stewart, from the 16th day of December 1941.

John "E" Hughes, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Arnold A. Lund, from the 9th day of January 1942.

John B. Maas, Jr., from the 9th day of January 1942.

Henry S. Sabatier, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Louis R. Smunk, from the 9th day of January 1942.

John R. Stack, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Robert W. Teller, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Joe L. Warren, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Joseph W. White, Jr., from the 9th day of January 1942.

Eugene A. Trowbridge, from the 7th day of February 1942.
 Jack L. Brushert, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 William E. Crowe, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Samuel B. Folsom, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Thomas W. Furlow, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 George L. Hollowell, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Samuel Richards, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Leo F. Tatro, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Howard L. Walter, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 George D. Wolverton, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 William "B" Freeman, from the 12th day of March 1942.
 Raymond A. Rogers, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.
 Wallace G. Wethe, from the 12th day of March 1942.
 Frank P. Barker, Jr., from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Willard C. Lemke, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Carroll E. McCullah, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Edward J. Montagne, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Clarence H. Moore, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Arthur N. Nehf, Jr., from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Martin B. Roush, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Carol D. Dalton, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 James E. Grubbs, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 Henry W. Horst, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 Robert W. Johannesen, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 William G. Johnson, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 Francis X. Witt, Jr., from the 17th day of March 1942.
 William P. Dukes, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 Jay E. McDonald, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 John D. Noble, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 Billie K. Shaw, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 Joseph F. Wagner, Jr., from the 25th day of March 1942.
 George B. Herlihy, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 Dale M. Leslie, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 William P. Mitchell, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 James L. Secrest, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 Gordon L. Allen, from the 23d day of April 1942.
 Richard L. Braun, from the 23d day of April 1942.
 Werlin U. Gray, from the 23d day of April 1942.
 Clinton C. Basinger, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Edmund W. Berry, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Howard W. Bollmann, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Dan H. Johnson, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Billy C. Marks, from the 15th day of May 1942.
 Frank B. Baldwin, from the 22d day of May 1942.
 Charles H. Woodley, from the 22d day of May 1942.

Robert H. Brumley, from the 8th day of June 1942.
 Dennis P. Casey, from the 8th day of June 1942.
 William L. Gunness, from the 8th day of June 1942.
 Samuel "C" Roach, Jr., from the 8th day of June 1942.
 John Skinner, Jr., from the 8th day of June 1942.
 Fred J. Gilhuly, from the 18th day of June 1942.
 John E. Worlund, from the 18th day of June 1942.
 Robert E. Kelly, from the 19th day of June 1942.
 Harold L. Spears, from the 19th day of June 1942.
 Augustus L. Arndt, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 Percy F. Avant, Jr., from the 25th day of June 1942.
 William N. Case, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 John E. Hays, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 Archie D. Simpson, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 Clyde H. Davis, Jr., from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Richard E. French, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Lynn "N" Kelso, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Henry M. Turner, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Ray K. Wolff, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 John F. Eolt, Jr., from the 18th day of July 1942.
 Elmer F. Brooks, Jr., from the 18th day of July 1942.
 John G. Charbeneau, from the 18th day of July 1942.
 Reinhardt Leu, from the 18th day of July 1942.
 Jack M. Wells, from the 18th day of July 1942.
 John L. Morgan, Jr., from the 23d day of July 1942.
 Wilbur J. Thomas, from the 23d day of July 1942.
 Floyd C. Haxton, from the 5th day of August 1942.
 George Major, from the 5th day of August 1942.
 Thomas L. Wyatt, from the 5th day of August 1942.
 Warner O. Chapman, from the 11th day of August 1942.
 Thomas R. Merritt, from the 11th day of August 1942.
 Robert Dalley, Jr., from the 16th day of September 1942.
 Homer L. Daniel, from the 16th day of October 1942.
 "H" Leverett Jacobl, from the 16th day of October 1942.
 Richard K. Todd, from the 16th day of October 1942.
 John D. Curd, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Julius F. Koetsch, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Robert D. Morris, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Paul A. Mullen, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Wiley A. Green, from the 16th day of November 1942.
 Charles "E" Cornwell, from the 1st day of December 1942.
 Arthur P. Duttonhofer, Jr., from the 1st day of December 1942.
 Walter A. Petersen, from the 1st day of December 1942.
 William W. Blakely, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943.

Richard R. Breen, a citizen of Louisiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944:

Fred F. Harbin, a citizen of North Carolina.
 Michael D. Benda, a citizen of West Virginia.

William A. Wilson, a citizen of Kentucky.
 Edwin L. Hickman, Jr., a citizen of Tennessee.

Howard K. Alberts, a citizen of New Jersey.
 John B. Sullivan, a citizen of New Jersey.
 Robert E. Wagoner, a citizen of Wisconsin.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph F. Burt to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Oliver Edmund Clubb to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Randolph A. Kidder to be a consul of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the great source of life and light, from whom our spirits have come and unto whom they shall return, we pray that while we live and labor for a brief time upon this earth we may be numbered among those who do justly, who love mercy, and who walk humbly with the Lord.

This is a day which Thou has made and we will rejoice and be glad in it. Grant that we may face with courage and hope its many duties and tasks that challenge the consecration of the noblest abilities and capacities with which we have been endowed. Help us to respond with unfaltering faith and fortitude to the call of human need and the upward urge of Thy spirit.

Hasten the day when the forces of righteousness shall be victorious and all selfish and sordid ambitions and all those sinister and debasing feelings of hatred, prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance which are continually storming the citadel of man's soul shall be forever banished from the world and become supplanted by love and good will. Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include